VOLUME VIII OCTOBER, 1913 NUMBER 4

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE LATER 'APPIUS AND VIRGINIA.'

IN the process of detailed work on Webster, I have come to the conclusion that *Appius and Virginia* is not by him. Proofs of the attribution of a play based on internal evidence are necessarily long, detailed and elusive. I have only space to summarise them here. May it be kept in mind that by compression they lose much of their force.

I.

Appius and Virginia has passed, hitherto, in the general body of Elizabethan plays without attracting any particular notice. It seems desirable to show first that it deserves notice.

It is to be remarked that critics, whether of the Elizabethans in general or of Webster in particular, have always exhibited either conscious discomfort or unconscious haste and lack of interest, when they came to *Appius and Virginia.* As they have never questioned its genuineness, their perfunctory and unprofitable treatment of it is noteworthy. They cannot fit it in.

We may sympathise with them. The flavour by which we recognise Webster developed between 1607 and 1615. It is a clinging, unmistakeable one. In the earlier collaborate plays, *Northward Ho!* and *Westward Ho!* we do not expect to find it. In the late imitative plays it is less powerful. But a close, long scrutiny, before which *Appius and Virginia* grows more cold and strange, increasingly reveals Webster in *The Devil's Law-Case,* even in *A Cure for a Cuckold,* of which he only wrote part.

Examine *Appius and Virginia* æsthetically and as a whole. Webster is a dogged, slow writer; and romantic—in the sense that single scenes, passages, or lines have merit and intensity on their own account. And there is a kind of dusty heat over all. *Appius and Virginia* is precisely the opposite to all this. Its impression is simple and cool. It seems more an effort at classicism,—unconscious perhaps. There are not many

lines and images you stop over. You see right on to the end of the road.

Descend from general to particular æsthetic examination; Webster is still absent. The characters are slight and ordinary. The clown is quite unlike anything we could expect Webster to invent. Appius, the Machiavellian villain, has a little fire. Virginius is a mere stage-creature, and, as that, quite creditable. Virginia is a virgin. The crowd of soldiers is a soldiers' crowd. Webster's characters, in the other plays, if they do not always (compared at least with Shakespeare's) make a highly individual impression on the mind, always leave a dent.

The metre of *Appius and Virginia* is not Webster's. The blank verse is much stricter. Webster's loose, impressionistic iambics, with their vague equivalence and generous handling, are very unlike these regular, rhetorical lines. Webster's great characteristic of beginning a line with what classical prosodists would call an anapæst finds no place here. And the general metrical technique of which this is only the most obvious manifestation—the continual use of substitution and equivalence in the feet, or, better, the thinking more in lines and less in feet—is strikingly absent in *Appius and Virginia*. These prosodic habits are also almost as little prominent in the possibly Websterian part of *A Cure for a Cuckold*. But there is another point which marks *Appius and Virginia* off from all the rest. In the other plays, there is little attempt to keep a line that is divided between two speakers pentametrical. If one speech ends with a line of two and a half feet, the next may begin with a line of two feet, or of three, or with a complete line. *Appius and Virginia* keeps almost invariably to the old tradition, by which the speeches dovetail perfectly. There are other differences, such as the greater number of rhyming lines in *Appius and Virginia*, which could more easily be the result of a conscious attempt to write in a different style[1].

The first and almost the only characteristic in *Appius and Virginia* to strike a casual reader, is the vocabulary. It is full of rare, Latin words, mostly wearing an air of recent manufacture; 'to deject' (in a literal sense), 'munition,' 'invasive,' 'devolved,' 'donative,' 'palpèd,' 'enthronized,' 'torvèd,' 'strage,' and many more. This very un-Websterian vocabulary is a mark of certain writers, especially about the beginning

[1] For the perplexing metrical part which *Appius and Virginia* plays, see the metrical table on p. 190 of Dr Stoll's *John Webster*. Its resemblance to *A Cure for a Cuckold* is only in some directions, and more statistical than real. The metre of both is rather smooth; but in a very different way. It is, of course, rather risky to lay much emphasis on *A Cure for a Cuckold*: it may have been worked over by Rowley.

of the seventeenth century. Among the major dramatists, Ben Jonson had a touch of this Latin word-coinage; Marston, Heywood, Chapman, and Shakespeare show it chiefly.

In this and every notable respect the language of *Appius and Virginia* is unlike Webster's. Whatever linguistic point of detail you choose, the lack of resemblance is obvious. To take one instance: Dr Stoll (p. 40), in trying to prove the Webster authorship of the major part of *A Cure for a Cuckold*, uses as a test the occurrence of the exclamation 'Ha!' especially as comprehending a whole speech. He says it is unusually frequent in Webster. 'It appears in the *White Devil* 13 times, 6 of them being whole speeches; in *Malfi* 10 times, 2 of them whole speeches; in the *Law-Case* 9 times, 4 of them whole speeches; in *Appius and Virginia* twice; in the main plot of the *Cure for a Cuckold* 7 times, 2 of them whole speeches.' The oddness of the *Appius and Virginia* figures does not strike Dr Stoll, who is on other business. He explains them, vaguely, by 'the frigidity and academic character of the play'; which is far from fair to the slightly Marlovian, and 'Machiavellian' nature of much of *Appius and Virginia*. It is not a Jonsonian Roman play. There is no reason why Appius should not have said 'Ha!' thirteen times, six of them whole speeches, except that the author did not write like that.

Again, the word 'foul' was, characteristically, a common one with Webster. It occurs often in *The White Devil*, on almost every page in *The Duchess of Malfi*. 'Think on your cause,' says Contarino to Ercole in *The Devil's Law-Case* II, 2; 'It is a wondrous foul one.' And when the real 'devil's law-case' comes on (IV, 2), the shameless Winifred desires, 'Question me in Latin, for the cause is very foul.' There was this habit in Webster of thinking of such moral rottenness as 'foul,' slightly materialising it. A reader would feel safe in betting that Webster would use the word several times in connection with the trial of Virginia. One knows his comment on it, as one knows how a friend will take a piece of news. The word does not occur in this passage.

Analysis might find a thousand more points, positive and negative, in which the style and vocabulary of *Appius and Virginia* are obviously not those of Webster. When the language is unanalytically tasted, as a whole, the dissimilarity becomes still more obvious. In the general handling and construction of the play there is an un-Websterian childishness and crudity. Webster could be *gauche* enough at times, but not in this shallow, easy way. I need only enumerate some of the instances.

There are the soliloquies of II, 1, the end of I, 3, and especially the beginning of the same scene, the interview between Marcus and Appius. Appius is melancholy, declares himself in love. Marcus asks with whom, offering to act pander. Appius tells him, Virginia.

Marcus. Virginia's!
Appius. Hers.
Marcus. I have already found
An easy path which you may safely tread,
Yet no man trace you.

He goes on to explain in detail his rather elaborate plan. The liberty taken with time, in V, 3, is extreme, even for an Elizabethan, where Icilius is allowed the duration of *seven lines*, to go from the prison to the house where Virginia's body lies, take it up, and start back with it through the streets, moving the populace to uproar! The extraordinary and pointless discrepancies between II, 3, the interview between Appius and Icilius, and III, 1, Icilius' account of the interview, may possibly, but not probably, be explained by a theory of the play being in a cut and revised state, for which there is other evidence. But nothing can be thought too childish to come from the hand of the author of the crowd-effects of Act II, 2; where the farcical congruence of the choruses culminates in

First Soldier. ...from thence arise
A plague to choke all Rome!
Omnes. And all the suburbs!

These are some of the immediate difficulties in believing *Appius and Virginia* to be by Webster. A few of them might be evaded by a theory of Webster attempting a fresh *genus*; but not the subtler points of atmosphere and style. The further difficulties of explaining the nature and date of the play, if it is by Webster, strengthen our incredulity. *How* Webster came to write such a play, his various critics and commentators have not tried to explain; chiefly because they have not understood that there was any need of explanation. They have realised neither how astonishing a *tour de force* it is, for an author so completely to sink his personality, nor that Webster is the last man to be capable of such a feat. The dumb evidence of their inability to make this play fit in with or illuminate the rest of Webster's work, speaks for them. *When* Webster wrote it, is a question they have tried to answer, however dimly. Their answers have all been different, and all importantly unconvincing. In the first place, the whole style of the play, in plot, characterisation, and metre, suggests an early date, somewhere between 1595 and 1615; and joins it, loosely, with *Julius Caesar*

(1601?), *Coriolanus* (1608?) and Heywood's *The Rape of Lucrece* (1604?). This is especially to be remarked of the metre, which is rather formal, without being stiff. It has few 'equivalences.' The licences are regular. They mostly consist of a few limited cases in which elision occurs, always noticeably, and almost conventionally—the chief example is between 'to' and a verb beginning with a vowel[1]. I have already noticed the metrical dove-tailing of speeches. All these prosodic characteristics suit, some rather demand, a date between 1600 and 1610. So does the influence of Marlowe and Machiavellism, and the character of the clown, Corbulo, who is staringly introduced into the original story. Finally the general and specific dissimilarity in style of *Appius and Virginia* and Webster's other plays forbids a middle date, and requires an early rather than a late one, if the play be his. Only a young hand could have disguised its individuality so completely.

The other evidence, however, points in precisely the opposite direction. When you try to suggest a possible date you meet bewildering difficulties. One of the most certain things about *Appius and Virginia* is that it is strongly influenced by Shakespeare's Roman plays, and especially by *Coriolanus*[2]. *Coriolanus* is dated by most critical opinion as 1608–9. So *Appius and Virginia* must be at least as late as 1609. But that is definitely in Webster's middle, most individual, period. *The White Devil* appeared in 1611, and he was confessedly a long time in writing it. If the author of *The White Devil* wrote *Appius and Virginia*, it cannot have been only a year or eighteen months before. Then again you cannot slip the Roman play amazingly between *The White Devil* and *The Duchess of Malfi* (c. 1613). It would be far easier to say that Shakespeare wrote *Titus Andronicus* between *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night*. And you must leave a decent interval after *The Duchess of Malfi*. You feel inclined to drop it quietly in the vacant space between *The Duchess of Malfi* and *The Devil's Law-Case*. But the progression in style here is so clear and gradual that it is nearly as difficult to squeeze it in there as between the tragedies. Besides, if you get as late as 1617 or 1618, you may as well listen to Dr Stoll's evidence—that it is not mentioned in Webster's dedication to *The Devil's Law-Case* (printed 1623), and that it shows such close debts to Shakespeare that Webster must have written it after reading the First Folio (1623). So, buffeted and confused, you take refuge in his

[1] e.g. 'To obey, my lord, and to know how to rule....'

[2] Stoll, pp. 193—197, illustrates this fully enough. A single reading of the play will prove it.

spacious '1623-1639'; a date which is in direct opposition to all your first conclusions. And if you want to adorn the affair, now you have settled it, with the circumstance and charm of reality, you may attribute, with Dr Stoll, not only Webster's style and handling to his study of the First Folio, but his Marlowe characteristics to his recent study of *The Massacre at Paris* (1593) preparatory to writing his own play *The Guise*, his clown to his friendship with Heywood, his strange style to his imitativeness of the fashion of his time, and his writing this sort of play at all to his fancy for going back to the fashions of twenty or thirty years earlier!

II.

Well then, what reasons are there for thinking that Webster did write *Appius and Virginia*? The reasons are two,—the attribution in 1654, and repetitions or parallels between Webster's other plays and this. They require examination.

Appius and Virginia was printed and published in 1654, as by John Webster. The same edition was put forth in 1659 with a new title-page 'Printed for Humphrey Moseley[1]'; and again in 1679, 'Acted at the Duke's Theatre under the name of *The Roman Virgin* or *Unjust Judge*.' It is possible that Moseley only took over the edition between 1654 and 1659. In that case the attribution has even less weight. But let us put it at its strongest (and most probable) and suppose that Moseley was always the publisher. It is being realised more and more how little importance attributions of the second half of the seventeenth century have. The theatrical traditions had been broken. Publishers attributed by guess-work, or hearsay, or to sell the book. In 1661, Kirkman published *The Thracian Wonder* as by Webster and Rowley. 'No one,' says Professor Vaughan, 'except the editor, has ever supposed that Webster can have had a hand in it.' Yet it is as Websterian as *Appius and Virginia*.

Humphrey Moseley was, as a matter of fact, one of the more trustworthy publishers of the time. Malone and Professor Parrott are too hard on him. But he had the faults and ignorance of his period. Among other attributions he gives *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* to Shakespeare, *The Parliament of Love* (Massinger) to Rowley, *The Faithful Friends* to Beaumont and Fletcher, *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany* to Chapman, *The Widow* (Middleton) to Jonson, Fletcher, and

[1] For Moseley and his activities, *v. Dictionary of National Biography*; Plomer, *Dictionary of Booksellers and Printers*, 1641—1667; Masson, *Life of Milton*, III, 448—457, VI, 352; Parrott, *Tragedies of Chapman*, p. 683; Malone, *Variorum Shakespeare*, III, 229.

Middleton, *Henry I* and *Henry II* (Davenport, probably) to Shakespeare and Davenport, and *The History of King Stephen, Duke Humphrey*, and *Iphis and Iantha* to Shakespeare.

Webster's works have, in one way and another, been pretty thoroughly scrutinised for parallels. Resemblances in phrasing and thought between *The White Devil, The Duchess of Malfi, The Devil's Law-Case* and *A Monumental Column* are very numerous. *A Cure for a Cuckold* and *Appius and Virginia* are far less closely joined. In *A Cure for a Cuckold* there are certain minor echoes of phrase that have some weight. I give a list of the only connections of *Appius and Virginia* with the other plays that have been discovered previously, or that I have found[1].

(*a*) *Appius and Virginia*, 149:

I have seen children oft eat sweetmeats thus,
As fearful to devour them:

Duchess of Malfi, 65:

I have seen children oft eat sweetmeats thus,
As fearful to devour them too soon.

(*b*) *A. and V.*, 151:

One whose mind
Appears more like a ceremonious chapel
Full of sweet music, than a thronging presence.

Duchess of Malfi, 79:

His breast was filled with all perfection,
And yet it seemed a private whispering-room
It made so little noise of 't.

Monumental Column, ll. 78, 79:

Who had his breast instated with the choice
Of virtues, though they made no ambitious noise.

(*c*) *A. and V.*, 163:

Virginia. But she hath a matchless eye, Sir.
Corbulo. True, her eyes are not right matches.

White Devil, 31:

Brachiano. Are not those matchless eyes mine? I had rather
Vittoria.
They were not matches[2].

(*d*) *A. and V.*, 165:

I only give you my opinion,
I ask no fee for 't.

[1] The references are all by the pages of Dyce's one-volume edition.
[2] Quarto reading. Dyce reads 'matchless': obviously wrongly.

Westward Ho! 242:

Take my counsel: I'll ask no fee for 't.

White Devil, 7:

This is my counsel and I'll ask no fee for 't.

(*e*) *A. and V.*, 168:

As aconitum, a strong poison, brings
A present cure against all serpents' stings.

White Devil, 26:

Physicians, that cure poisons, still do work
With counter-poisons.

(*f*) *A. and V.*, 171:

I vow this is a practised dialogue:
Comes it not rarely off?

Duchess of Malfi, 63:

I think this speech between you both was studied,
It came so roundly off.

(*g*) *A. and V.*, 172:

For we wot
The Office of a Justice is perverted quite
When one thief hangs another[1].

Duchess of Malfi, 90:

The office of justice is perverted quite
When one thief hangs another.

(*h*) *A. and V.*, 180:

Death is terrible
Unto a conscience that's oppressed with guilt!

Duchess of Malfi, 99:

How tedious is a guilty conscience!

(*i*) *A. and V.*, 173:

I have sung
With an unskilful, yet a willing voice,
To bring my girl asleep.

White Devil, 45:

I'll tie a garland here about his head;
'Twill keep my boy from lightning.

Besides these, there are various words; 'dunghill' (*A. and V.*, 171, 166, *White Devil,* 25), 'mist' (of ignorance) (*A. and V.*, 167, 170, *White*

[1] So Quarto. Dyce thinks this a mistake for 'The office of justice...' as in *The Duchess of Malfi* quotation. He is probably right.

Devil, 50[1]) are favourite and typical words of Webster. Note also 'pursenet' in the sense of 'wile' (*A. and V.*, 170, *Devil's Law-Case*, 130) and 'not-being' (*A. and V.*, 180, *Duchess of Malfi*, 90).

Of the resemblances, (*c*) is a common joke, (*e*) a common idea (the Ben Jonson, *Sejanus*, quotation which Dyce gives in a note is much nearer than the passage from the *White Devil* to the *A. and V.* quotation), and (*d*) sounds like a catch-phrase. In (*h*) the two examples occur near the end of their plays, and slightly recall each other in atmosphere. In (*i*) the same effect of tenderness is got by the word 'my.'

It seems to me that (*b*), a suggestion of Mr Crawford's, holds good only between *The Duchess of Malfi* and *A Monumental Column*.

These six examples are such that they would be important if they were ten or fifteen times as numerous; being so few they are of no account. And I do not think many more could be found.

The rest, (*a*), (*f*) and (*g*), are another matter. It is to be noted that (*a*) and (*g*) are exactly the sort of images and proverbial sayings (note the expression 'we wot') that Webster and others collected. If Webster wrote *Appius and Virginia*, we can only say that he must have used the same note-book that he wrote *The Duchess of Malfi* with. If not, either the author of *Appius and Virginia* compiled *his* note-book out of *The Duchess of Malfi* among other books; or else they used common sources. (*f*) is an even more significant parallel. For the circumstances are similar. In each drama two 'villains' play into each other's hands in a dialogue which the 'hero' discerns, suddenly, or guesses, to have been rehearsed. It is not an obvious thought. That it should be expressed at all is noteworthy; that it should be expressed with such similarity of phrase and (which is important) metrical setting, is a valuable proof of identity of authorship.

The words have little weight. The use of 'mist' is striking; but 'dunghill,' though it irresistibly recalls Webster's manner, was not monopolised by him; and 'not-being' (the repetition of which Dr Stoll seems to think remarkable) is not rare enough or typical enough to be of any significance.

There the proofs of Webster's authorship end. The attribution of a late publisher, which is evidence of a notoriously untrustworthy character, and three or four passages of repetition or resemblance,—that is all. The conclusion, for any impartial mind, is that there is very

[1] Especially the similarity between 'in a mist,' *A. and V.*, 167, and 'in a mist,' *White Devil*, 50.

little evidence of the play being Webster's, rather more for his having had a finger in it, but much stronger evidence still that he had practically nothing to do with it.

III.

If that is all there is to be said, we are left with an impression of general confusion, and a strongish feeling that anyhow Webster is responsible for very little of the play.

But the question would be cleared, if anyone discovered a more promising candidate. This I believe I have done. I think I can show that *Appius and Virginia* is largely, or entirely, the work of Thomas Heywood. I shall give the direct proofs first: then the more indirect ones, by showing how his authorship fits in with the various facts that have made such havoc of Webster's claims.

I have mentioned the queer distinctive vocabulary, especially of Latin words, used in *Appius and Virginia.* The fact that Heywood uses a very similar vocabulary, especially in all his more classical works, would of itself be of little weight. But an individual examination of all the very unusual words and phrases in this play, together with a hurried scrutiny of Heywood's dramas, provides very startling results. I give a list. More minute search, no doubt, might largely increase it. It serves its purpose. I begin with the more striking words[1].

A. and V., 179:

> Redeem a base life with a noble death,
> And through your lust-burnt veins *confine* your breath.

'Confine,' in this sense of 'banish,' was very rare. The *N.E.D.* gives one more or less contemporary example from Holinshed, and one, the only one, from Shakespeare. Dyce, in a footnote, gives five passages; he comments, 'it is somewhat remarkable that they are all from Heywood.' I can add two. It was a very special word of Heywood's.

Pleasant Dialogues, II, p. 115:

> The soul *confine*,
> The body's dead, nor canst thou call it thine.

Royal King and Loyal Subject, 82:

> Which as your gift I'll keep, till Heaven and Nature
> *Confine* it hence.

It is to be noticed that the context in these two examples is similar.

[1] The references to Heywood's plays are to the pages of the six-volume Pearson edition, 1874.

Other examples are in *The Golden Age*, 23, *The Rape of Lucrece*, 242, *A Challenge for Beauty*, 10, *The Brazen Age*, 199, Γυναικεῖον, IV, 207.

A. and V., 174:

> If the general's heart be so *obdure.*

'Obdure' is a very rare word. It does not occur in Shakespeare. In the Elizabethan age it seems to have been used only by one or two religious writers and Heywood. Heywood is always using it. This word alone might almost be accepted as a proof that the passage it occurs in was by him.

'Obdure' as adjective occurs in *Lucrece*, 219, 224, *Golden Age*, 56, 60, *Fortune by Land and Sea*, 375, *Pleasant Dialogues*, 114: as verb, *English Traveller*, 90, Γυναικεῖον, I, 55, *Brit. Troy*, VI, 11. 'Obdureness' comes in Γυναικεῖον, I, 55.

A. and V., 162: '*Palpèd.*'

There are only three known instances of this extraordinary word; this one, and two from Heywood's acknowledged works: *Brit. Troy*, XV, XLII, and *Brazen Age*, 206.

I add a short list of instances that are less persuasive individually, but have enormous weight collectively.

A. and V., 152:

> Why should my lord droop, or *deject* his eye?

Rare in this literal sense: not in Shakespeare. Heywood, *If you know not me*, 206:

> It becomes not
> You, being a Princess, to *deject* your knee.

Cf. also *Lucrece*, 173, 'dejected,' 174, 'dejection.'

A. and V., 153, *prostrate*, in a very uncommon metaphorical usage:

> Your daughter...most humbly
> *Prostrates* her filial duty.

This is paralleled twice in Heywood's *The Rape of Lucrece*, and once in another play:

Rape of Lucrece, 173:

> This hand...
> Lays his victorious sword at Tarquin's feet,
> And *prostrates* with that sword allegiance.

pp. 211, 212:

> The richest entertainment lives with us (i.e. that lives with us)
> According to the hour, and the provision
> Of a poor wife in the absence of her husband,
> We *prostrate* to you.

Royal King and Loyal Subject, 42:

> To you...my liege,
> A virgin's love I *prostrate*.

A. and V., 153:

> An *infinite*
> Of fair Rome's sons.

'Infinite' is sometimes, though rarely, used by itself, more or less as a number. But used merely as a substantive, as here, it is very unusual. It is found in Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece*, 234, *Golden Age*, 36; cf. also *Rape of Lucrece*, 243:

> Before thee *infinite* gaze on thy face.

A. and V., 153:

> The iron wall
> That rings this pomp in from *invasive* steel.

A rare word. Once in Shakespeare. The phrase is repeated in Heywood's *Golden Age*, 40:

> The big Titanoys
> Plow up thy land with their *invasive* steel.

A. and V., 153:

> Let Janus' temple be *devolv'd* (i.e. overturned).

A very rare word in this sense. The *N.E.D.* gives only two other examples, one of 1470, one of 1658. Not in Shakespeare. Heywood, *Lucrece*, 244:

> For they behind him will *devolve* the bridge.

A. and V., 155:

> You *mediate* excuse for courtesies.
> (i.e. beg, on somebody else's behalf.)

Rare: not in Shakespeare. In Webster's *The White Devil* in the sense of 'to take a moderate position'! Marlowe and one or two prose-writers have used it in the sense of the text. It is found in Heywood, *English Traveller*, 84:

> Will you...
> Not *mediate* my peace?

A. and V., 161:

Upon my *infallid* evidence.

Very rare: not in Shakespeare. *N.E.D.* gives only two other examples, of which one is Heywood, *Hierarch.*, v, 308:

All these are *infallid* testimonies.

A. and V., 174:

Let him come *thrill* his partisan
Against this breast.

'*Thrill*, i.e. hurl,—an unusual sense of the word,' says Dyce. He adds two quotations, both from Heywood's *Iron Age*, e.g. p. 316:

All which their javelins *thrild* against thy breast.

Note the correspondence of phrase. This use is not found in Shakespeare.

A. and V., 174:

Marshal yourselves, and entertain this *novel*
Within a ring of steel.

An uncommon substantive, not found in Shakespeare. Heywood, *English Traveller*, 27, *Golden Age*, 55, *Iron Age, Second Part*, 373, *Brazen Age*, 202.

A. and V., 179:

This sight has stiffened all my *operant* powers.

Dyce quotes *Hamlet*, III, 2:

My *operant* powers their function leave to do.

And it is quite probable that the author of *Appius and Virginia* is borrowing the phrase from Shakespeare, for the word is very uncommon. Heywood, in *The Royal King and the Loyal Subject*, probably written just about the same time as *Hamlet*, uses the word, in the same sense (p. 6), only writing 'parts' instead of 'powers.' The sense of this passage is even nearer to the *Hamlet* line: they are obviously connected—through Heywood, as usual, echoing rather than imitating Shakespeare.

When I forget thee may my *operant parts*
Each one forget their office.

It seems to me probable that Heywood echoed Shakespeare immediately in *The Royal King and the Loyal Subject*, and soon after, rather less closely in *Appius and Virginia*.

A. and V., 179: *Strage.*
A rare Latinism: not in Shakespeare. Heywood uses it in *Pleasant Dialogues*, 111, and in *The Hierarchie.*

There are other general verbal resemblances. The kind of word Heywood invents and uses is the same in *Appius and Virginia* and through the six volumes of his collected 'dramatic works.' 'Eternized,' 'monarchizer,' 'applausive,' 'opposure' occur in the latter; 'imposturous,' 'enthronized,' 'donative,' in the former. Who could distinguish? In *Appius and Virginia*, 178, he invents (possibly adopts) the rare verb 'to oratorize.' In *The English Traveller*, 68, he uses the form 'to orator.' Resemblances of phrase are as numerous, though not so striking. Heywood was too ordinary and too hurried a writer to have much eccentricity of phrase. He wrote in the common style of the time, only slightly garnished by a few queer pet words and a certain Latinism of vocabulary. He does not repeat lines and metaphors as many writers do; only, occasionally, phrases and collocations of words, but these of such a kind as all his contemporaries repeated also. The result is that it is difficult to find parallels of this nature between any of his works. What there are between *Appius and Virginia* and the rest, therefore, have more weight than they would have in the case of some other dramatists.

There is a rather puzzling expression just at the end of *Appius and Virginia* (p. 180):

> Appius died like a Roman gentleman,
> And a man both ways knowing.

It is, metrically and in sense, very like a sentence at the end of *The English Traveller* (p. 94):

> Dalavill
> Hath played the villain, but for Geraldine,
> He hath been each way noble.

Cf. also *Fortune by Land and Sea*, 386:

> Come! I am both ways armed against thy steel.

One of the few points which the author of *Appius and Virginia* introduced into the stories of Dionysius and Livy, is the plot to coerce Virginia by refusing the army's pay and forcing Virginius to sell his goods to pay them. In the first act of *A Maidenhood Well Lost* (espec. 111 ff.) Strozza lays much the same plot against 'the General' and his daughter, and what ensues, the army starving and the general paying the soldiers himself, is exactly the same. This shows, at least,

that the idea was in Heywood's mind when he was writing *A Maidenhood Well Lost.* What is more significant is that another idea in the camp-scenes in *Appius and Virginia* (also original) was in his mind when he was writing *The Rape of Lucrece.* On page 205 the sentry makes the entirely unnecessary remark about his occupation:

> Thus must poor soldiers do;
> While their commanders are with dainties fed,
> And sleep on down, the earth must be our bed.

This is the *motif* of the whole mutiny-scene in *Appius and Virginia* (p. 156). See especially the lines:

> I wake in the wet trench,
> Loaded with more cold iron than a gaol
> Would give a murderer, while the general
> Sleeps in a field-bed, and to mock our hunger
> Feeds us with scent of the most curious fare
> That makes his tables crack.

It is obvious that Heywood's mind ran easily into the same trains of thought. Suggest 'Camp' to him, and he readily pictures, in his pleasant light water-colours, the starving, cold soldiers *sub divo* and the general feeding luxuriously and enjoying a bed. Indeed, the parallels of idea with *Lucrece* are numerous, as one would expect. Heywood felt that a great man of that time was attended by a 'secretary.' Porsenna, King of the Tuscans, in his tent (*Lucrece*, 245) wants lights. He calls 'Our secretary!' The secretary appears with 'My lord?' In *Appius and Virginia* (159, 160) when Appius is bearded by Icilius, he calls out for help, 'Our secretary!' and summons him again at the end of the interview, 'Our secretary!...We have use for him.' Marcus appears:

> My honourable lord?....

There are other such small points—the bearing of the dead, bleeding bodies of Lucrece, and of Virginia, before the people, and their sympathy and rage; the vagueness of locality in each play; and so on.

But there is a more remarkable resemblance. It is part of a general link with Heywood's works,—the clown. Dr Stoll has three pages (197—200) pointing out and illustrating the kinship of Corbulo in *Appius and Virginia* with Heywood's clowns, and especially the clown of *The Rape of Lucrece*[1]. The Heywood clown, an early type, was a simple, good-hearted creature, who had little to do with the play, and poured out puns and somewhat Euphuistic jokes to amuse the crowd. There was a painstaking, verbal tumbling they all indulged in. You

[1] See also Eckhardt, *Die lustige Person im älteren englischen Drama*, p. 433, etc.

can pick at random. 'If they suddenly do not strike up,' says Slime of the lingering musicians[1], 'I shall presently strike them[2] down.' It is the voice of Corbulo. The clown in *The Golden Age* is precisely the same. So is the one in *Lucrece*, and as the plays are more alike, the similarity of his position is the more easily seen. It is, in the first place, a very remarkable coincidence that he should be there at all. *Appius and Virginia* and *The Rape of Lucrece* are the only Roman plays of the adult Elizabethan drama to introduce such a character. It was exactly like Heywood to modify the tradition and *genus* in this way. It would not have been at all like Webster. Dr Stoll emphasises and details this similarity so admirably, and as he has no idea that *Appius and Virginia* is not by Webster, his testimony is so valuable in its impartiality, that I cannot do better than quote his description.

> In both cases the clown is servant to the heroine, and he appears in like situations. He is sent by his mistress on errands, is taken to task by her for ogling at her maid (and that in the latter's presence), and is left to chatter with other servants alone. He jokes about his mistress's misfortune, about the sinners in the suburbs, and, being a Roman, out of the Latin grammar. And the comic side of both is the same. It lies all in the speeches—the clown plays no pranks and suffers no mishaps—and it has an episodic, random, and anachronistic character. It is all jest and repartee, puns, quibbles, and catches, and those neither clever nor new ; and the drift of it all, whenever it gets beyond words, is satire on London life and manners. It is good-humoured moreover, naive and dirty.

IV.

Here, then, in the first place, is a final argument against Webster's authorship of the play. Anyone who believes in it, has now got to explain away not only the date difficulty, not only the general æsthetic absurdity, not only the borrowing of a pet character of Heywood's, but also the sudden entire adoption of Heywood's individual, distinguishing vocabulary. Twenty years' friendship, you are to suppose, never affected Webster's vocabulary in this direction in the slightest degree. Then, in a transport of 'senile' affection, he hurled aside his own personality, and became mere Tom.

In the next place, consider how the theory of Heywood's authorship suits the facts of the play. If Heywood wrote *Appius and Virginia*, there is no difficulty about words or handling. He wrote the play most like it of all the plays in the world. There is no difficulty about style. It is exactly like Heywood when he is writing solemnly, as in parts of *Lucrece*, parts of the various 'Ages,' and the beginning and end of *The*

[1] *A Woman killed with Kindness*, 97.
[2] Old text 'thee.'

Royal King and the Loyal Subject. Only it is rather more mature, it has a little more freedom and rhetoric, than the early style of *Lucrece* and some of the 'Ages.' This suits the other indications of date. For, again, there is no difficulty about the date. The difference between *Lucrece* and *Appius and Virginia* is mostly due to the fact that *Coriolanus* (c. 1608) must have intervened. Any date after 1608 would do; immediately after is the most likely, because the resemblances of style and vocabulary are, on the whole, to the rather earlier works.

I imagine that the main part of *Appius and Virginia*, as we have it, was written then. It may, and indeed must, have been cut about and altered, by Heywood or others, before it found a last home with 'Beeston's boys' in 1639, or a final resting-place with Moseley in 1654.

The metrical characteristics noticed in *Appius and Virginia* are Heywood's. Heywood's blank verse, says Dr Schipper[1], is 'sehr gewandt und harmonisch gebaut.' This applies perfectly to our play. He also calls attention, of course, to the number of rhyming couplets, ending off even short speeches. It is this characteristic in *Appius and Virginia* that slightly puzzles Dr Stoll and suddenly upsets his metrical tables (p. 190). The only detailed examination of Heywood's prosody that I know is in Dr Franz Albert's 'Über Thomas Heywood's Life and Death of Hector of Troy[2].' It is concerned mainly with certain sides of Heywood's work, mostly undramatic, and it is not very perspicacious, having most of the faults of Germans trying to understand English metre. But it enumerates some of the more tangible characteristics, and lays great stress on that trick of conscious and rather conventionalised elision, especially between 'to' and a verb with an initial vowel, that I had already independently noticed in *Appius and Virginia*, and have remarked on earlier in this paper.

The various characteristics of the play that are no bar to Webster's authorship fit in equally well or better with Heywood's. This is the case with the numerous slight imitations of phrases of Shakespeare, which are rather more a mark of Heywood than of Webster[3].

The sources of *Appius and Virginia* are, ultimately, Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. If any translation of Livy was used, it was probably Philemon Holland's (1600). No English translation of Dionysius at this time is known. The sources favour Heywood if anything. Of Webster's classical knowledge we can only say that he knew

[1] *Englische Metrik*, 1881, Vol. II, p. 335.
[2] Especially pp. 22, 172.
[3] See *Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vol. VI, p. 106.

other people's Latin quotations. Thomas Heywood, Fellow of Peterhouse, Translator of Sallust, Ovid, and Lucian, author of the learned *Hierarchie, Apology for Actors,* Γυναικεῖον, etc., was a lover of learning and a reader of Latin and Greek all his life.

V.

It remains to see what explanation, on the assumption that Heywood is mainly or entirely the author of *Appius and Virginia,* can be given of the exiguous pieces of evidence that point towards Webster. There is first Moseley's attribution. I have said how little weight the attribution of a late publisher carries. If the choice between giving the play to Heywood or Webster lay with Moseley, what inducement there was either way would have led him to choose Webster. For while neither was very famous in the second half of the seventeenth century, some of Webster's plays were revived from time to time, but none, as far as is known, of Heywood's.

But it is easy enough to imagine a play of Heywood's coming without a name, or with a wrong name, into the hands of a publisher of 1654. There were two hundred and twenty plays 'in which I have had either an entire hand or at least a main finger[1].' On any that came to the press in his lifetime, he seems to have kept an eye. For the others, when they had passed out of his control, he seems not to have cared. 'Many of them, by shifting and change of companies have been negligently lost; others of them are still retained in the hands of some actors, who think it against their peculiar profit to have them come in print[2].' *Appius and Virginia* may have belonged to either, more probably to the latter class. And it is very easy to trace a possible and probable history of this play[3]. We first hear of it in 1639, in the possession of Christopher Beeston's company of boys, who occupied the Cockpit Theatre from 1637 onwards. Now Christopher Beeston and Thomas Heywood were members of Queen Anne's company from its foundation in 1603. In 1617 the Cockpit opened, and Queen Anne's company went there till 1619. From 1619 to 1625 the lady Elizabeth's company held the Cockpit, and probably, though not certainly, Heywood and Beeston were of them. From 1625 to 1637 they were followed by Queen Henrietta's company, managed by Beeston. And then came Beeston's company of boys, who possessed the play in 1639. Among

[1] *The English Traveller*: To the Reader. [2] *Ibid.*
[3] See Murray, *English Dramatic Companies*, Vol. I, pp. 265—270, and elsewhere.

all the various strands of continuity in the Elizabethan theatres and companies, this is a very definite one, forming about Heywood and Beeston, in connection first with Queen Anne's company, and then, locally, with the Cockpit. And with Heywood, Beeston, and, I believe, *Appius and Virginia*, on this long journey, goes significantly *The Rape of Lucrece*.

It is also to be noticed that it was Queen Anne's company that acted two of Webster's three original plays, *The White Devil* (1611) and *The Devil's Law-Case* (1620). He seems to have gone off to the King's Men between these, with *The Duchess of Malfi* (1612–13). But we may suppose that he had most to do with Queen Anne's company.

There remain the similarities and repetitions of phrase in *Appius and Virginia* and Webster's plays. As I have said, only three of these are of any importance, two exact verbal repetitions and one striking similarity of phrase and idea; all connecting with *The Duchess of Malfi*[1]. If Heywood wrote the main part or all of *Appius and Virginia*, there are six possible explanations of these passages. They are an accident; or Heywood imitated Webster; or Webster imitated Heywood; or the play was touched up by some Queen's company actor or author who knew *The Duchess of Malfi*; or Webster himself touched it up; or Webster and Heywood wrote *Appius and Virginia* together, Heywood taking the chief part.

The first is improbable, though far less improbable than it seems. For both (*a*) and (*g*) are sententious sayings such as the Elizabethans delighted to note down and repeat. Webster is full of these. And the identical repetition of one of them by him and Marston supported great theories of his imitation of Marston till Mr Crawford discovered it in Montaigne[2], the common source to which they had independently gone. Still, the coincidence of the two apophthegms is rather much to account for in this way. It is possible, but that is all. And there is the further difficulty against it that Heywood was not wont to write in this note-book manner. He worked too quickly.

This also counts against what might otherwise seem an easier theory, that (*f*) is either an accident or the imitation of reminiscence, but that these two (*a*) and (*g*) are the result of Heywood directly copying Webster—noting down and using two of his phrases. The possibility of this is also lessened by the probability on other grounds that *Appius and Virginia* is earlier than *The Duchess of Malfi*. Webster may have

[1] (*a*) (*f*) and (*g*) in my list.
[2] Crawford, *Collectanea*, Series II, p. 35.

imitated Heywood. He was a great friend of his at this time[1]. And if *Appius and Virginia* was, as is probable, written early, it must have appeared in the same theatre and about the same time as *The White Devil*[2]. Also it was Webster's habit to take down from other authors and afterwards use sentences and similes of an apophthegmatic or striking nature. We know that he treated Donne, Montaigne, Jonson, Sidney, and perhaps Marston and Dekker in this way. Why not Heywood, his friend and collaborator? It is true Heywood does not lend himself often so easily to such use. That, and the fact that he has not been thoroughly searched for such a purpose, may explain why there are few other known parallels. This theory is the more probable because the lines of (*a*) and (*g*), and their ideas, seem more natural and in place in *Appius and Virginia* than they do in *The Duchess of Malfi*. And it is easier to imagine Webster finding (*Appius and Virginia*, 149),

> I have seen children oft eat sweetmeats thus,
> As fearful to devour them,

and adding (*Duchess of Malfi*, 65) the words 'too soon' than Heywood doing the opposite.

There remain the various possibilities of two hands having been at work, or the same hand at two periods. These are favoured by the *a priori* probability of a play that had at least thirty years of acting life, being altered in that period, and also by certain indications that all is not right with the play as it stands[3]. It might, of course, have been changed by any member of the Queen's Servants Company. But he would not be likely to have incorporated passages from *The Duchess of Malfi*, a play belonging to the King's Men. If it was Heywood himself that touched it up, in 1613 or so, he might quite well have done this, being a friend of Webster's. But it is most easy to suppose Webster the reviser. Either this, or his collaboration, is rendered rather probable by the presence through the play of ten or a dozen passages, averaging perhaps two lines, that seem to taste slightly of his style. Perhaps it is true that any play, examined closely, would yield the same. And certainly Heywood *could* have written them. But, at moments, there

[1] He wrote some lines 'To his beloved friend Master Thomas Heywood,' prefixed to Heywood's *Apology for Actors*, 1612.

[2] It is an important indication of the date of *Appius and Virginia* that *The White Devil* (1611) does not borrow from it, and *The Duchess of Malfi* (1612–13) does.

[3] The chief of these are, shortly: (*a*) In the beginning of Act I there is a queer and solitary passage of prose, which looks like an abbreviation for acting purposes. Dyce suspects it; and it is to be noted that the speech following the prose contains one of the two 'repetitions' from *The Duchess of Malfi*. (*b*) II, 3 (p. 160), Icilius' sudden collapse and Appius' puzzling 'It is no more indeed' suggest abbreviation. (*c*) The conflicting account in III, 1, of the events of II, 3, suggests two hands, or revision.

does seem to be the flavour, almost imperceptibly present. If reviser or collaborator, Webster obviously had recourse to the same note-books as he used for *The Duchess of Malfi*, which suggests that he would be working on it about 1612 or soon after. And in either case, we should have a very good explanation of his name being connected with the play. If he revised, we must suppose that he shortened and made more dramatic the very beginning of the play, and heightened, or even rewrote, the Trial-scene (IV, 1). It is important to notice that in this rather long scene (1) there are no very characteristic words of Heywood's, (2) there are more of the phrases, words and lines that are faintly reminiscent of Webster than anywhere else in the play[1], (3) two[2] of the three strong indications of a connection with Webster occur.

Give Webster the revision of these two scenes, and you have satisfied his utmost claims. To yield him more is mere charity. If he collaborated, it is impossible to divide the play up between the two. In certain scenes (e.g. IV, 2 and V, 3) Heywood's vocabulary comes out more clearly than in the rest. But one can only say that Webster's part is very small compared with Heywood's, as unimportant as it is in *Northward Ho!* and *Westward Ho!*

In sum: general, critical and æsthetic impressions, more particular examination of various aspects, and the difficulty of fitting it in chronologically, make it impossible to believe that *Appius and Virginia* is by Webster, while the evidence in favour of his authorship is very slight. All these considerations, and also remarkable features of vocabulary and characterisation, make it highly probable that it is by Heywood. The slight similarities between *The Duchess of Malfi* and *Appius and Virginia* may be due to Webster borrowing in *The Duchess of Malfi* from Heywood, or revising *Appius and Virginia*, or having, not for the first time, collaborated with Heywood, but very subordinately. In any case, *Appius and Virginia* must be counted among Heywood's plays; not the best of them, but among the better ones; a typical example of him in his finer moments, written rather more carefully than is usual with that happy man.

RUPERT BROOKE.

CAMBRIDGE.

[1] 'Dunghill,' 'mist,' 'pursenet,' 'to bring my girl asleep,' 'and this short dance of life is full of changes' etc. etc.

[2] i.e. (*f*) and (*g*).

SWIFT'S 'TALE OF A TUB[1]'

III.

Date of Composition[2].

A Tale of a Tub, in the first four issues, consists of the following divisions:

Dedication to Lord Somers.
The Bookseller to the Reader.
The Epistle Dedicatory to Prince Posterity.
The Preface.
A Tale of a Tub.
Sect. I. The Introduction.
Sect. II.
Sect. III. A Digression concerning Critics.
Sect. IV.
Sect. V. A Digression in the Modern Kind.
Sect. VI.
Sect. VII. A Digression in praise of Digressions.
Sect. VIII.
Sect. IX. A Digression concerning Madness.
Sect. X. A Farther Digression.
Sect. XI.
The Conclusion.

To the fifth edition (1710) was prefixed *An Apology* with a *Postscript.*

The stories of the three brothers are told in Sections II, IV, VI, VIII, XI. Sections II and IV deal with the history of Christianity up to the

[1] Concluded from p. 313.
[2] Unless otherwise stated, all references in this section are to Vol. I of the Bohn edition of Swift's *Prose Works.*

Reformation. Sections VI, VIII and XI are almost entirely concerned with the history of Jack (representing the Calvinists). The subject of Section VIII (on the Æolists) is closely connected with the *Discourse on the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit.*

The question whether Swift was responsible for the form which the volume took when issued, is hardly capable of solution with our present information. Such statements as those in the *Apology*[1] and in *The Bookseller to the Reader*[2] are explicit as far as they go, but do not tell us much.

However, as Swift never made any substantial changes in the book we must suppose that he was not much dissatisfied with it, notwithstanding

[1] He [Swift] was then [i.e. when he wrote the *Tale*] a young gentleman much in the world, and wrote to the taste of those who were like himself; therefore, in order to allure them, he gave a liberty to his pen, which might not suit with maturer years, or graver characters, and which he could have easily corrected with a very few blots, had he been master of his papers, for a year or two before their publication. (pp. 12—13.)

To instance only in that passage about the three wooden machines, mentioned in the Introduction: In the original manuscript there was a description of a fourth, which those who had the papers in their power, blotted out, as having something in it of satire, that I suppose they thought was too particular. (pp. 15—16.)

How the author came to be without his papers, is a story not proper to be told, and of very little use, being a private fact of which the reader would believe as little, or as much, as he thought good. He had, however, a blotted copy by him, which he intended to have writ over with many alterations, and this the publishers were well aware of, having put it into the bookseller's preface, that they *apprehended a surreptitious copy, which was to be altered*, etc. This, though not regarded by readers, was a real truth, only the surreptitious copy was rather that which was printed; and they made all haste they could, which, indeed, was needless; the author not being at all prepared; but he has been told the bookseller was in much pain, having given a good sum of money for the copy. (p. 22.)

In the author's original copy there were not so many chasms as appear in the book; and why some of them were left, he knows not; had the publication been trusted to him, he would have made several corrections of passages, against which nothing hath been ever objected. (p. 23.)

The author observes, at the end of the book, there is a discourse called *A Fragment*, which he more wondered to see in print than all the rest. Having been a most imperfect sketch, with the addition of a few loose hints, which he once lent a gentleman, who had designed a discourse on somewhat the same subject; he never thought of it afterwards; and it was a sufficient surprise to see it pieced up together, wholly out of the method and scheme he had intended; for it was the ground-work of a much larger discourse; and he was sorry to observe the materials so foolishly employed. (*ibid.*)

[2] It is now six years since these papers came first to my hand, which seems to have been about a twelvemonth after they were writ; for the author tells us in his preface to the first treatise, that he has calculated it for the year 1697, and in several passages of that Discourse, as well as the second, it appears they were written about that time.

As to the author, I can give no manner of satisfaction; however, I am credibly informed, that this publication is without his knowledge; for he concludes the copy is lost, having lent it to a person, since dead, and being never in possession of it after: so that, whether the work received his last hand, or whether he intended to fill up the defective places, is like to remain a secret.

If I should go about to tell the reader by what accident I became master of these papers, it would, in this unbelieving age, pass for little more than the cant or jargon of the trade. I therefore gladly spare both him and myself so unnecessary a trouble. There yet remains a difficult question, why I published them no sooner. I forbore upon two accounts; first, because I thought I had better work upon my hands; and secondly, because I was not without some hope of hearing from the author, and receiving his directions. But I have been lately alarmed with intelligence of a surreptitious copy.

what he wrote in the *Apology*[1]. He was not the man to be guided by a bookseller's apprehensions. On the whole it seems most likely that Swift arranged, or did not prevent, the publication of the book through the agency of a friend (Hofmann suggests Addison[2]), and that his friend allowed himself a certain amount of latitude in suppressing things that seemed dangerous[3].

The sources of information as to the date of composition are these:

(*a*) Swift's statements in the *Apology* of 1709 (published in the fifth edition of the *Tale*, 1710), and in *The Bookseller to the Reader.* (*b*) The date subscribed to the *Dedication to Prince Posterity* (December, 1697) and the date mentioned in the *Preface* (August, 1697). (*c*) References in the text to persons and events. (*d*) Considerations arising from the circumstances of Swift's life, and the order of his other works.

Swift's statements would date the book at 1696 or 1697. It is difficult to see why he should have chosen these dates unless they were the true ones: no doubt he wanted to make it appear that he had written the work as a young man, in order that excuse might be found for some of its contents. But at the expense of omitting some references to Dryden and Bentley he might have put it much earlier. This would have been very much more to his purpose, especially if he had made it appear that he had written the book before he took orders (1694). It is true that he never acknowledged the authorship of the book: and that in 1704 he may not have foreseen the harm it would do him: but if he did not foresee the consequences, he had no motive for falsifying the dates: if he did foresee the consequences, he would have falsified the dates more effectively. In the main, therefore, we must accept Swift's statements, unless there is good evidence against them.

References to persons and events are usually an unsatisfactory kind of evidence, because they are easily added after the main part of a work has been completed. And they are especially perilous here, because the book was not prepared all at one time[4]. However, in default of

[1] Some overtures have been made, by a third hand, to the bookseller, for the author's altering those passages which he thought might require it; but it seems the bookseller will not hear of any such thing, being apprehensive it might spoil the sale of the book. (p. 23.)

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 30—32.

[3] Cf. the history of the publication of *Gulliver's Travels*, in Mr G. R. Dennis's edition, pp. xii ff. and xxvi ff.

[4] [the] discourse is the product of the study, the observation, and the invention of several years. (*Apology*, p. 17.)

...it was thought necessary, in order to quiet the minds of men, that this opposer [Wotton] should receive a reprimand, which partly occasioned that discourse of the Battle of the Books; and the author was farther at the pains to insert one or two remarks on him, in the body of the book. (*ibid.* p. 19.)

better evidence we may consider what this kind suggests. The important passages which can be dated are the following[1]:

Dedication to Lord Somers.

'Tis true, I should be very loth, the bright example of your Lordship's virtues should be lost to after-ages, both for their sake and your own; but chiefly because they will be so very necessary to adorn the history of a *late reign*. (p. 28.)

The late reign is that of William III, who died on the 8th March, 1702.

The Bookseller to the Reader.

It is now six years since these papers came first to my hand, which seems to have been about a twelvemonth after they were writ; for the author tells us in his preface to the first treatise, that he has calculated it for the year 1697, and in several passages of that Discourse, as well as the second, it appears they were written about that time.

The dates show that this passage was written in 1704.

Dedication to Prince Posterity.

I do therefore affirm, upon the word of a sincere man, that there is now actually in being a certain poet, called John Dryden, whose translation of Virgil was lately printed in a large folio, well bound, and, if diligent search were made, for aught I know, is yet to be seen. There is another, called Nahum Tate, who is ready to make oath, that he has caused many reams of verse to be published, whereof both himself and his bookseller, (if lawfully required,) can still produce authentic copies, and therefore wonders why the world is pleased to make such a secret of it. There is a third, known by the name of Tom Durfey, a poet of a vast comprehension, an universal genius, and most profound learning. There are also one Mr Rymer, and one Mr Dennis, most profound critics. There is a person styled Dr B –tl-y, who has written near a thousand pages of immense erudition, *giving a full and true account* of a certain squabble, of wonderful importance, between himself and a bookseller: He is a writer of infinite wit and humour; no man rallies with a better grace, and in more sprightly turns. Farther, I avow to your Highness, that with these eyes I have beheld the person of William W-tt-n, B.D., who has written a good sizeable volume against a friend of your governor, (from whom, alas! he must therefore look for little favour,) in a most gentlemanly style, adorned with the utmost politeness and civility; replete with discoveries equally valuable for their novelty and use; and embellished with traits of wit, so poignant and so apposite, that he is a worthy yokemate to his forementioned friend. (pp. 37—38.)

The references to Dryden must have been written after the publication of his *Virgil* in July, 1697. Rymer published *An Essay, concerning Critical and Curious Learning: In which are contained some Short Reflections on the Controversie betwixt Sir William Temple and Mr*

[1] As references to Wotton and Bentley are numerous the following list of dates will save a good deal of repetition:
(i) Sir William Temple: *Miscellanea.* The Second Part....I. *Upon Ancient and Modern Learning*...1690.
(ii) William Wotton: *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*...1694.
(iii) Wotton and Bentley: *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*...The Second Edition...*With a Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris*...1697.
(iv) Richard Bentley: *A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris*...1699.

Wotton...in 1698. Dennis's first critical work, *The Impartial Critick*, appeared in 1693. The reference to Bentley's 'thousand pages of immense erudition' must have been written in or after 1699 when his complete *Dissertation* was published.

At the end the *Dedication* is dated 'Decemb. 1697.'

The Preface.

(*a*) The wits of the present age being so very numerous and penetrating, it seems the Grandees of Church and State begin to fall under horrible apprehensions, lest these gentlemen, during the intervals of a long peace, should find leisure to pick holes in the weak sides of Religion and Government. (p. 39.)

(*b*) However, being extremely solicitous, that every accomplished person, who has got into the taste of wit calculated for this present month of August, 1697,..... (p. 41.)

The reference to 'a long peace' presents some difficulty. The Conference at Ryswyck opened May 7, 1697. Peace was concluded in September of the same year. Probably Swift regarded the settlement as final, and was looking forward to 'a long peace,' not back upon it. If we take the date (August, 1697) at p. 41 as applying to the whole of the Preface, he was writing before the Peace of Ryswyck was signed.

(*c*) *The tax upon paper does not lessen the number of scribblers, who daily pester*, &c. (p. 42.)

The tax upon paper was imposed in 1696 (*Statutes of the Realm*: VII, pp. 189 and ff.).

The Introduction.

(*a*) The Hind and Panther. This is the masterpiece of a famous writer now living, intended for a complete abstract of sixteen thousand school-men, from Scotus to Bellarmin. (p. 56.)

Dryden died in 1700. *The Hind and the Panther* was published in April, 1687.

(*b*) The Wise Men of Gotham, *cum appendice*. This is a treatise of immense erudition, being the great original and fountain of those arguments, bandied about, both in France and England, for a just defence of the moderns' learning and wit, against the presumption, the pride, and ignorance of the ancients. This unknown author has so exhausted the subject, that a penetrating reader will easily discover whatever has been written since upon that dispute, to be little more than repetition. An abstract of this treatise has been lately published by a worthy member of our society. (p. 56.)

'The Wise Men of Gotham, *cum appendice*,' is Wotton's *Reflections* with Bentley's *Dissertation* (1697).

(*c*) I confess to have been somewhat liberal in the business of titles, having observed the humour of multiplying them, to bear great vogue among certain writers, whom I exceedingly reverence. And indeed it seems not unreasonable, that books, the children of the brain, should have the honour to be christened with variety of names, as well as other infants of quality. Our famous Dryden has

ventured to proceed a point farther, endeavouring to introduce also a multiplicity of godfathers; which is an improvement of much more advantage upon a very obvious account. (p. 58.)

The reference in the last passage is to Dryden's *Virgil* published in July, 1697.

Section III.

Every true critic is a hero born, descending in a direct line, from a celestial stem by Momus and Hybris, who begat Zoilus, who begat Tigellius, who begat Etcætera the elder; who begat Bentley, and Rymer, and Wotton, and Perrault, and Dennis; who begat Etcætera the younger. (p. 71.)

See the notes on the passages quoted from the *Dedication to Prince Posterity*.

Section V.

(*a*) When I consider how exceedingly our illustrious moderns have eclipsed the weak glimmering lights of the ancients, and turned them out of the road of all fashionable commerce, to a degree, that our choice town wits, of most refined accomplishments, are in grave dispute, whether there have been ever any ancients or no: in which point, we are likely to receive wonderful satisfaction from the most useful labours and lucubrations of that worthy modern, Dr Bentley. (p. 90.)

The reference to Dr Bentley must have been written in 1697 or later.

(*b*) But I have still behind a fault far more notorious to tax the author [Homer] with; I mean, his gross ignorance in the common laws of this realm, and in the doctrine as well as discipline of the Church of England. A defect, indeed, for which both he, and all the ancients, stand most justly censured, by my worthy and ingenious friend, Mr Wotton, Bachelor of Divinity, in his incomparable treatise of *Ancient and Modern Learning*. (p. 92.)

The reference to Wotton need not be later than 1694, when his *Reflections* appeared.

Section IX.

(*a*) This, indeed, was the fatal mistake of that worthy gentleman, my most ingenious friend, Mr Wotton: a person, in appearance, ordained for great designs, as well as performances; whether you will consider his notions or his looks. (p. 117.)

On Wotton see the second note on Section V.

(*b*) Upon all which, and many other reasons of equal weight, though not equally curious, I do here gladly embrace an opportunity I have long sought for, of recommending it as a very noble undertaking to Sir Edward Seymour, Sir Christopher Musgrave, Sir John Bowls, John How, Esq., and other patriots concerned, that they would move for leave to bring in a bill for appointing commissioners to inspect into Bedlam, and the parts adjacent. (pp. 121—2.)

In April, 1699, a clause was added to the Land Tax Bill by which 'seven Commissioners were empowered to take account of the property forfeited in Ireland during the late troubles.' (Macaulay, *Hist. Eng.*, Chap. XXIV.)

(*c*) Is any student biting his straw in piece-meal, swearing and blaspheming...? Let the right worshipful the commissioners of inspection give him a regiment of dragoons, and send him into Flanders among the rest. (p. 122.)

The reference to Flanders is difficult. There was no war in Flanders between 1697 and 1701 to which English soldiers would be sent, though during this period, 'the Seventh Fusiliers were retained in the Dutch service, or at any rate in Holland' (Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, I, 388). In June, 1701, twelve battalions were shipped to Holland (*ibid.* 399). Swift may have written the passage before the Peace of Ryswyck (Sept. 1697), or have spoken of Flanders as a common battle ground, or he may have added the passage later.

Section X.

In due deference to so laudable a custom, I do here return my humble thanks to His Majesty, and both houses of Parliament. (p. 125.)

His Majesty is William III. Queen Mary died in 1694, William in 1702.

Section XI.

How Jack's tatters came into fashion in court and city; how he got upon a great horse and eat custard. (p. 141.)

The following note appears in the fifth edition of *A Tale of a Tub*: 'Sir Humphry Edwyn, a Presbyterian, when lord-mayor of London, in 1697, had the insolence to go in his formalities to a conventicle, with the ensigns of his office[1].'

Conclusion.

I have already hired an author to write something against Dr Bentley, which, I am sure, will turn to account. (p. 142.)

Dr Bentley: see note on p. 457.

From this evidence we get the following result[2]:

Dedication to Lord Somers...March 1702 +.

The Bookseller to the Reader...1704.

Epistle Dedicatory to Prince Posterity (dated December, 1697)... 1693 +, 1697 +, 1698 +, 1699 +.

The Preface (dated August, 1697)...1696 +, Sept. 1697 +.

A Tale of a Tub.

Sect. I. The Introduction.

...1687—1700, 1697 +, July, 1697 +.

Sect. II...No date.

[1] See also Wilson's *Defoe*, I, pp. 270 and ff.

[2] The sign + is used to mean 'or later': thus '1694 +' means '1694 or later.'

Sect. III...1693 +, 1697 +, 1698 +, 1699 +.
Sect. IV...No date.
Sect. V...1694 +, 1697 +.
Sect. VI...No date.
Sect. VII...No date.
Sect. VIII...No date.
Sect. IX...1694 +, April, 1699 +.
Sect. X...Between 1694 and 1702.
Sect. XI...1697 +.
The Conclusion...1697 +, or 1699 +.

If we except the *Dedication to Somers* and *The Bookseller to the Reader*, it will be seen that on this evidence the date 1696 to 1699 may reasonably be held to cover the writing of the whole book. It is probable that the dates which Swift gives (1696 and 1697) are true for a very large part of the work. There is no certain evidence in favour of later dates than those mentioned here[1].

This date (1696—1699) is confirmed by reference to the circumstances of Swift's life and to his other work. He was living with Temple from 1689 to 1690, from 1691 to 1694, and from 1696 to 1699. During the interval 1694 to 1696 he was in Ireland. In October, 1694, he was ordained Deacon, and in 1695 he was appointed Prebendary of Kilroot, near Belfast. Hatred of the Nonconformists is one of the chief motives of the *Tale*, and in Ulster he was likely to confirm his ancestral prejudices against them[2]. On his return to Temple's house he would be ready to write his book. Very possibly he had begun or planned it at Kilroot, and there Waring may have seen some part of it in 1696. Deane Swift was probably referring to this in the passage quoted earlier in this paper (p. 305). He was a very inaccurate writer. In the passage we are discussing he gives the date of the publication of *A Tale of a Tub* as 1697 (instead of 1704), and calls Waring 'Warren.' Swift was probably not nineteen years old when Waring saw his MS., but twenty-nine[3]. He was nineteen years old in 1686, and twenty-nine years old in 1696. From 1689 to 1693 Swift wrote Pindaric Odes and a few other poems. From 1693 to 1698 we have nothing. After 1698 there are a few poems: then come the editions of Temple's Works (1700 and later),

[1] Hofmann's dates are based partly on doubtful evidence, and partly on misunderstandings of the text of *A Tale of a Tub*, but he is right in calling attention to the intimate knowledge of London shown in some parts of the *Tale*.
[2] See *Autobiography*, B. XI, pp. 371 ff., and compare Jeremy Taylor's experiences: Gosse, *Jeremy Taylor*, Chaps. V and VI.
[3] Cf. Forster, *Life of Swift*, p. 84.

and the *Dissensions at Athens and Rome*, published in 1701. From 1696 to 1699 we may well suppose him to have been occupied with the *Tale of a Tub*, the *Battle of the Books*, and the *Discourse*.

Swift's early works lend no support to the theory that he was capable of writing *A Tale of a Tub* (or any considerable part of it) in 1686 or 1688. Nevertheless it may be true that the sections containing the allegory were written or planned somewhat earlier than the rest of the book. I do not think that Sections II, IV and VI can be separated from Sections VIII and XI as work of a much earlier period.

IV.

The Mechanical Operation of the Spirit.

In the Apology prefixed to the fifth edition of the *Tale of a Tub* (1710) Swift disclaimed responsibility for the *Discourse on the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*[1], and a footnote was added at the beginning of the text:

> This Discourse is not altogether equal to the former, the best parts of it being omitted; whether the bookseller's account be true, that he durst not print the rest, I know not; nor indeed is it easy to determine, whether he may be relied on in anything he says of this or the former treatises, only as to the time they were writ in, which, however, appears more from the discourses themselves than his relation. (p. 191.)

In the first and subsequent editions a *Bookseller's Advertisement* was prefixed to the *Discourse*:

> The following Discourse came into my hands perfect and entire. But there being several things in it which the present age would not very well bear, I kept it by me some years, resolving it should never see the light. At length, by the advice and assistance of a judicious friend, I retrenched those parts that might give most offence, and have now ventured to publish the remainder; Concerning the author I am wholly ignorant, neither can I conjecture whether it be the same with that of the two foregoing pieces, the original having been sent me at a different time, and in a different hand. The learned reader will better determine; to whose judgment I entirely submit it.

Swift had lent the work to a gentleman while it was still 'a most imperfect sketch, with the addition of a few loose hints,' and was 'surprised to see it pieced up together, wholly out of the method and scheme he had intended,' and 'sorry to observe the materials so foolishly employed.' The Bookseller received the work 'perfect and entire,' but suppressed part of it. What are we to make of these statements?

[1] The passage is printed at p. 455 above.

The only passages which date the work are the following:

(*a*) I have not had a line from the *Literati* of Topinambou these three last ordinaries. (p. 192.)

This contains a reference to Boileau's epigrams on Perrault's *Siècle de Louis le Grand.* One of these appeared in *Some Thoughts upon reviewing The Essay of Ancient and Modern Learning,* by Sir William Temple, printed for the first time in 1701, in the third part of Temple's Miscellanea, issued under Swift's supervision. This particular epigram had been written in 1687[1].

(*b*) The first ingredient toward the Art of Canting is, a competent share of *inward light*; that is to say, a large memory, plentifully fraught with theological polysyllables, and mysterious texts from holy writ, applied and digested by those methods and mechanical operations, already related: the bearers of this light, resembling lanthorns compact of leaves from old Geneva Bibles; which invention, Sir Humphrey Edwin, during his mayoralty, of happy memory, highly approved and advanced; affirming the Scripture to be now fulfilled, where it says: *Thy word is a lanthorn to my feet, and a light to my paths.* (p. 202.)

On Sir Humphry Edwin see p. 460 above. He was Lord Mayor in the year 1697–8.

So far as this evidence shows, the *Discourse* would seem to belong to the same period as the rest of the volume in which it appeared, namely 1696–9, and I do not find anything to contradict this result.

It would seem probable that the *Discourse* was originally written as part of *A Tale of a Tub,* and in close connection with Sections VIII and XI. Swift may have rejected it, and then have begun to recast it. The person who sent the volume to the Bookseller may have put the *Discourse* into the form in which it now appears. Some such hypothesis would justify the statements both of the Bookseller and of Swift.

A. C. GUTHKELCH.

LONDON.

[1] See Rigault, *Histoire de la Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes,* p. 158, note 2.

RICHARDSON AND HIS FRENCH PREDECESSORS

It has been a debated question whether the resemblance which, with many differences, is sufficiently obvious, between the work of Marivaux in fiction, and that of Richardson, is merely a coincidence, or is due to acquaintance on the part of the English writer with *La Vie de Marianne*, the greater part of which was published earlier than any of Richardson's novels. The differences are obvious enough. Marianne herself is very unlike Pamela and perhaps more unlike Clarissa. She is French, and they in their several ways are English. Everyone, too, can appreciate the superiority of Marivaux in grace and lightness of touch, in good taste and in refinement, and of Richardson in depth of observation, in command of pathos and in firmness of composition. It is needless to say, moreover, that the rather heavy morality of Richardson has no counterpart in Marivaux's work. Nevertheless the resemblances are sufficiently marked. Both writers deal with the romance of every-day life essentially in the same manner, and each in his own country is the founder of a new way of writing which leads directly to the modern novel. *Clarissa* was on its first appearance compared with *La Vie de Marianne* by a foreign critic, whose review of it was translated in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of June and August, 1749, a review from which Richardson himself quotes in the enlarged Postscript to *Clarissa*; and Diderot, Richardson's greatest admirer, says: 'Les romans de M. de Marivaux ont inspiré Paméla, Clarisse et Grandisson.' This in fact was the common opinion, at least among French critics, in the eighteenth century. On the other hand, English writers on Richardson in our own time have for the most part denied that there was any obligation of this kind, laying rather undue stress upon the points of difference, and somewhat ignoring the essential likeness[1]. It does not appear that anyone has hitherto cited the evidence of Richardson himself on the subject: yet there is in existence an utterance of his, or at least authorised by him, which may be regarded as practically settling the question.

[1] e.g. Mr Austin Dobson in his *Samuel Richardson* (English Men of Letters Series) and Miss Clara Thompson in her book *Samuel Richardson*.

As this interesting document is not very accessible, and has escaped the notice, apparently, of all those who have written upon Richardson in recent times, it will be convenient to cite it at length, after a few words of preliminary explanation.

Clarissa was published in 1748, in three instalments, the first two volumes being followed after an interval by the third and fourth, and these after several months by the last three. At the beginning of the fourth volume there is an address headed 'The Editor to the Reader.' (Richardson, I need hardly say, usually calls himself the 'editor' rather than the author of *Pamela* and *Clarissa*.) In this preface, which has been overlooked because it occurs only in the first edition, and in a place, too, where no preface was to be expected, the development of prose fiction in modern times is briefly traced, and the relation in which Richardson's work stands to that which has gone before it, is clearly indicated. It runs thus[1]:

If it may be thought reasonable to criticise the Public Taste, in what are generally supposed to be Works of mere Amusement; or modest to direct its Judgment, in what is offered for its Entertainment; I would beg leave to introduce the following Sheets with a few cursory Remarks, that may lead the common Reader into some tolerable conception of the nature of this Work, and the design of its Author.

The close connexion which every Individual has with all that relates to Man in general, strongly inclineth us to turn our observation upon human affairs, preferably to other attentions, and impatiently to wait the progress and issue of them. But, as the course of human actions is too slow to gratify our inquisitive curiosity, observant men very easily contrived to satisfy its rapidity, by the invention of *History*. Which, by recording the principal circumstances of past facts, and laying them close together, in a continued narration, kept the mind from languishing, and gave constant exercise to its reflections.

But as it commonly happens, that in all indulgent refinements on our satisfactions, the Procurers to our pleasures run into excess; so it happened here. Strict matters of fact, how delicately soever dressed up, soon grew too simple and insipid to a taste stimulated by the Luxury of Art: They wanted something of more poignancy to quicken and enforce a jaded appetite. Hence the original of the first barbarous *Romances*, abounding with this false provocative of uncommon, extraordinary, and miraculous Adventures.

But satiety, in things unnatural, soon brings on disgust. And the Reader, at length, began to see, that too eager a pursuit after *Adventures* had drawn him from what first engaged his attention, Man *and his Ways*, into the Fairy Walks of Monsters and Chimeras. And now those who had run farthest after these delusions, were the first that recovered themselves. For the next Species of Fiction, which took its name from its *novelty*, was of Spanish invention. These presented us with something of Humanity; but of Humanity in a stiff unnatural state. For, as everything before was conducted by *Inchantment*; so now all was managed by *Intrigue*. And tho' it had indeed a kind of *Life*, it had yet, as in its infancy, nothing of *Manners*. On which account, those, who could not penetrate

[1] I quote from a copy in my own possession of the Dublin edition (1748) published by Faulkner simultaneously with the first London edition. This seems to be rather rare, for neither the British Museum nor any other public library with which I am acquainted has a copy. The text is practically the same as that of the London edition.

into the ill constitution of its plan, yet grew disgusted at the dryness of the Conduct, and want of ease in the Catastrophe.

THE avoiding these defects gave rise to the *Heroical Romances* of the *French*; in which some celebrated Story of antiquity was so stained and polluted by modern fable and invention, as was just enough to shew, that the contrivers of them neither knew how to lye, nor speak truth. In these voluminous extravagances, *Love* and *Honour* supplied the place of *Life* and *Manners*. But the over-refinement of Platonic sentiments always sinks into the dross and feces of that Passion. For in attempting a more natural representation of it, in the little amatory Novels, which succeeded these heavier Volumes, tho' the Writers avoided the dryness of the Spanish Intrigue, and the extravagance of the French Heroism, yet, by too natural a representation of their Subject, they opened the door to a worse evil than a corruption of *Taste*; and that was, A corruption of *Heart*.

AT length, this great People (to whom, it must be owned, all Science has been infinitely indebted) hit upon the true Secret, by which alone a deviation from strict fact, in the commerce of Man, could be really entertaining to an improved mind, or useful to promote that Improvement. And this was by a faithful and chaste copy of real *Life and Manners*: In which some of their late Writers have greatly excelled.

IT was on this sensible Plan, that the Author of the following Sheets attempted to please, in an Essay, which had the good fortune to meet with success: That encouragement engaged him in the present Design: In which his sole object being *Human Nature*, he thought himself at liberty to draw a Picture of it in that light which would show it with most strength of Expression; tho' at the expence of what such as read merely for Amusement, may fancy can be ill-spared, the more artificial composition of a story in one continued Narrative.

HE has therefore told his Tale in a Series of Letters, supposed to be written by the Parties concerned, as the circumstances related, passed. For this juncture afforded him the only natural opportunity that could be had, of representing with any grace those lively and delicate impressions which *Things present* are known to make upon the minds of those affected by them. And he apprehends, that, in the study of Human Nature, the knowlege of those apprehensions leads us farther into the recesses of the Human Mind, than the colder and more general reflections suited to a continued and more contracted Narrative.

THIS is the nature and purport of his Attempt. Which, perhaps, may not be so well or generally understood. For if the Reader seeks here Strange Tales, Love Stories, Heroical Adventures, or, in short, for any thing but a *Faithful Picture of Nature* in *Private Life*, he had better be told beforehand the likelihood of his being disappointed. But if he can find Use or Entertainment; either *Directions for his Conduct*, or *Employment for his Pity*, in a HISTORY *of* LIFE *and* MANNERS, where, as in the World itself, we find Vice, for a time, triumphant, and Virtue in distress, an idle hour or two, we hope, may not be unprofitably lost.

In the second edition both this preface and that which had been published in the first volume were omitted, a short Advertisement to the Reader being substituted for the former of the two; but in the third and subsequent editions we find at the beginning of the work a preface which reproduces with slight alterations that in the first volume of the first edition, down to the end of the sixth paragraph, but from that point is different. In this preface Richardson makes the following reference to that which had appeared in the fourth volume of the first edition:

The work having been originally published at three different times; and a greater distance than was intended having passed between the first publication and

the second; a Preface was thought proper to be affixed to the third and fourth Volumes; being the second publication. A very learned and eminent Hand was so kind as to favour the Editor, at his request, with one. But the occasion of inserting it being *temporary*, and the Editor having been left at liberty to do with it as he pleased, it was omitted in the Second Edition, when the whole work came to be printed together.

Richardson then was not actually the writer of the preface which we have cited, but it was published of course with his authority. Who, we may ask, was the 'very learned and eminent Hand' who furnished it? Some things in it rather suggest Johnson; but there is a certain slovenliness of style here and there which makes it unlikely that he was the writer. In any case Richardson must be held responsible for the observations that it contains, so far as they concern his work.

We have then here a definite statement made on Richardson's own authority that in writing *Pamela* he had been following the lead of those modern French writers who had at length hit upon the true secret 'by which alone a deviation from strict fact, in the commerce of Man, could be really entertaining to an improved mind, or useful to promote that Improvement.' It is clear that Richardson acknowledges obligation to the way of writing in which some of the late French writers had greatly excelled, and that he ascribes not to himself but to the French the discovery of the true secret of fiction.

It remains only to say a word on a point which has often been objected, when this question of Richardson's possible obligations has been discussed. We know on the very best authority, namely by Richardson's own statement, that he did not read French. 'Your ladyship probably reads French: I cannot,' and so in other passages of his Letters. Therefore it is clear that for his acquaintance with French romances he must have been dependent on translations. This, however, does not cause any real difficulty. An English translation of *La Vie de Marianne*, so far as it had then proceeded, was published in 1736, four years before the publication of *Pamela*, and there were abundant means available for making acquaintance in English with the work of the Abbé Prévost, and still more with that of Le Sage, who are perhaps both to be included among the writers referred to with approval in this preface. And finally we know from Richardson's correspondence that he was in the habit of reading translations from the French, though no particular reference is made there to French novels.

G. C. MACAULAY.

CAMBRIDGE.

A CHRONOLOGICAL ARRANGEMENT OF DONNE'S SERMONS.

In an earlier article in the *Modern Language Review*[1] I tried to call attention to the intimate connection of Donne's sermons with his poems, and Professor Grierson's splendid edition of the poems has now demonstrated the importance of a study of the sermons for a right understanding of Donne's poetry. Again and again by his acquaintance with the sermons Professor Grierson has been able to restore and vindicate an earlier reading which previous editors had found hopelessly obscure[2].

Hitherto, however, no attempt has been made to arrange the sermons chronologically, though it is evident that the lack of such an arrangement is a serious stumbling-block in the way of any student who wishes to illustrate the course of Donne's life by reference to his sermons, or to trace any development in his theology and his inward experience during the sixteen years of his ministry.

In the *LXXX Sermons* of 1640 the sermons are arranged according to the festivals on which they were delivered. A certain number are dated, and these are generally arranged in order, e.g., the Christmas sermons are dated 1622, 1624, 1625, 1626, 1627, 1628, followed by an undated sermon. No conclusion can safely be drawn from the position of the undated sermon, as the Whitsunday sermons are thus arranged—1627, 1628, one undated, 1629, six undated. A gap in the series of sermons may sometimes be supplied from a later volume; thus in the series described as 'preached in Lent,' and delivered, as the dates show us, on what Walton calls Donne's 'old constant day,' the first Friday in Lent, the sermon missing for the year $162\frac{9}{1}$ is found as the fourth sermon in the *XXVI Sermons* of $166\frac{9}{1}$.

The *L Sermons* of 1649 are arranged as 'Sermons preached at Marriages,' 'at Christenings,' 'at Churchings,' 'at Lincoln's Inn,' 'at

[1] Vol. VII, p. 40, Jan. 1912, 'Donne's Sermons and their Relation to his Poetry.'

[2] E.g. *The Dreame*, l. 16; *To the Countesse of Bedford*, l. 58; *A Valediction: of my name, in the window*, l. 32; *Hymne to Christ*, l. 12; *Hymn to God my God*, l. 18.

Whitehall,' 'to the Nobility,' 'at S. Paul's,' 'at S. Dunstan's.' Many of the sermons are undated, and in one case the date given is certainly incorrect[1].

No arrangement is apparent in the *XXVI Sermons* of $16\frac{0}{1}$, but they are all (with three exceptions) headed and dated.

A further problem is presented by the untrustworthy nature of a few of the headings. Such a heading as that of the thirteenth Sermon in the *LXXX Sermons*, 'Preached in Lent, To the King, April 20, 1630,' is manifestly incorrect, for Ap. 20 fell that year on the Tuesday following the third Sunday after Easter. A sermon which appears twice in the *XXVI Sermons* (as nos. 5 and 16) is dated in one case Feb. 12, 1629, and in the other Feb. 22, 1629. Here a reference to the ecclesiastical calendar for the year $16\frac{29}{30}$ shows that the former date is probably correct, that being the first Friday in Lent.

On the whole, however, if used with caution, the headings are of considerable help in making a chronological arrangement of the sermons. It is impossible to accept Gosse's conjecture that the *LXXX Sermons* are identical with those revised by Donne during his retreat at Chelsea from the plague in 1625[2], and that therefore 'we may accept with confidence all the autobiographical touches which its headings supply.' Twenty-six of these sermons are dated subsequently to the letter in which Donne mentions this revision, and no. 71 is definitely connected by its heading with the last year of Donne's life—'At the Haghe Decemb. 19, 1619. I Preached upon this Text. Since in my sicknesse at *Abrey-hatche* in Essex, 1630. revising my short notes of that Sermon, I digested them into these two.'

It is possible that some of the *XXVI Sermons* were among the eighty revised by Donne in 1625, for the majority of them belong to the earlier part of his career and their headings are much more complete than those of the previous volumes.

Out of the hundred and fifty-four sermons contained in the three volumes, less than thirty offer us no clue as to their date. The headings of eighty-three contain either actual dates, or a clear reference to current events by which the sermon can be dated. By far the larger number of these belong to the later period of Donne's life, whilst he was Dean of St Paul's. Only three sermons are dated as

[1] Sermon 35, which is dated Feb. 21, 1611, several years before Donne entered Holy Orders.

[2] See the letter dated 25th November, 1625, quoted by Gosse in *Life and Letters of John Donne*, Vol. II, pp. 222–225, and Gosse's comment on p. 310. The impossibility of accepting Gosse's conjecture was pointed out in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vol. IV, pp. 240, 241, by Mr F. E. Hutchinson.

belonging to the two-and-a-half years between his ordination and his wife's death, and two of these are dull and lifeless. Probably Donne felt in later years that his early sermons were unworthy of his subsequent reputation, and therefore he did not trouble to revise and preserve them.

Each of the years 1618, 1619, and 1620 has four sermons ascribed to it. Those preached in 1619 are of especial interest owing to the circumstances under which they were delivered. One was 'preached to the Lords, upon Easter Day, at the Communion. The King being then dangerously sick at Newmarket.' The second was the 'Sermon of Valediction,' preached just before Donne's departure on the Bohemian Embassy with Lord Doncaster, and closely connected in thought and expression with the 'Hymn to Christ, at the Author's Last Going into Germany.' The third was preached in Heidelberg before the Princess Palatine, that unfortunate lady Elizabeth, daughter of James the First, who recalled in later years the 'delight' and 'edification' with which she had listened to Donne; and the fourth was delivered at the Hague, where the States General presented Donne with a gold medal representing the Synod of Dort.

Donne was appointed Dean of St Paul's in November, 1621, and after this the number of sermons which have been preserved increases rapidly. Ten are dated as belonging to 1622, and two of these were considered sufficiently important to be published at once. One was delivered at St Paul's Cross to explain 'some reasons, which His Sacred Majesty had been pleased to give, of those Directions for Preachers, which he had formerly sent forth.' James was delighted with this sermon, and desired to see it in print, saying 'that it was a piece of such perfection as could admit neither addition nor diminution[1].' The other was preached to the Virginia Company, and is described by Dr Jessopp as the first missionary sermon in the English language.

The sermons dated as belonging to 1623 are much less numerous. Donne's serious illness in the last months of the year deprived us of the Christmas sermon which it was his custom to preach at St Paul's, but gave us instead the *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions.*

In 1624 Donne was appointed Vicar of St Dunstan's, and we have several sermons preached in that church soon after his institution. The early part of 1625 is rich in sermons, amongst them being one preached a few days before King James' funeral and another in presence of his successor. No sermons date from the autumn of 1625, as

[1] Letter from Viscount Doncaster to Donne, in the Tobie Matthew Collection.

the plague was then raging in London, and Donne was forced to retreat to Chelsea—at that time a remote village—where he spent some months in Sir John Danvers' house, in the congenial company of George Herbert and his mother, the saintly lady to whom Donne had already addressed several poems, and whose funeral sermon he was to preach not quite two years later.

Donne returned to London to preach the Christmas sermon at St Paul's, and in January, 1626, he delivered a striking sermon at St Dunstan's on the plague which had so recently devastated the city. He was now at the height of his fame, and more of his sermons have been handed down to us as belonging to this year than to any other. The year 1627 was also marked by a large number of sermons, one of which incurred the suspicions of Charles the First and Laud, though Donne was able to clear himself to the King's satisfaction from all charge of disloyal Puritanism. Donne's letters show that he found it difficult to see how this sermon could have roused the King's displeasure in any way, but there are phrases in it which might easily have been construed as an attack on Henrietta Maria and the 'Romanising' policy which her influence was supposed to favour[1]. One of Donne's most interesting sermons of this year, 1627, is that preached on July 1 at Lady Danvers' funeral, in which he draws a striking picture of the home-life of the Herbert family.

During the years 1628 and 1629 Donne suffered from attacks of illness which for several months prevented him from preaching, but nevertheless we have a fair number of sermons dating from this time. It was not till the summer of 1630 that his health finally broke down. During his illness at Abury Hatch in the autumn of 1630 he revised some of his sermons, as we learn from the heading to no. 71 in the *LXXX Sermons*. He came to London again early in 163$\frac{0}{1}$ to preach before the King on the first Friday in Lent, when he delivered his last sermon, the famous 'Death's Duel,' which was published in 1632.

[1] E.g., 'When they [the Apostles] came in their peregrination, to a new State, to a new Court, to Rome it selfe, they did not enquire, how stands the Emperour affected to Christ, and to the preaching of his Gospel; Is there not *a Sister*, or *a Wife* that might be wrought upon to further the preaching of Christ? Are there not some persons, great in power and place, that might be content to hold a party together, by admitting the preaching of Christ? This was not their way; They only considered who sent them; Christ Jesus: And what they brought; *salvation* to every soul that embraced Christ Jesus....All Divinity that is bespoken, and not ready made, fitted to certaine turnes, and not to generall ends; And all Divines that have their *soules* and *consciences*, so disposed, *as their Libraries may bee*, (At that end stand Papists, and at that end Protestants, and he comes in in the middle, as neare one as the other) all these have a brackish taste; as a River hath that comes near the Sea, so have they, in comming so neare the Sea of Rome.' L, 27, p. 231.

After the sermon he went back to his house, 'out of which,' as Walton says, 'he never moved, till, like St Stephen, "he was carried by devout men to his grave."' His death took place on March 31, 1631.

The following list includes only those sermons of which the date is clearly given in the heading. The dates in italics have been supplied from a comparison of the ecclesiastical and civil (Julian) calendars for the period.

Vol. and No.	Date	Place and Occasion
xxvi, 11[1]	1615 Ap. 30 (*3rd Sun. after Easter*)	At Greenwich.
„ 6	1616 Ap. 21 (*3rd Sun. after Easter*)	At Whitehall.
„ 24	161$\frac{6}{7}$ Mar. 24	'A Sermon Preached at Pauls Cross to the Lords of the Council, and other Honorable Persons...It being the Anniversary of the Kings coming to the Crown, and his Majesty being then gone into Scotland.'
„ 7[2]	1617 Nov. 2 (*20th Sun. after Trinity*)	At Whitehall.
„ 18	„ Dec. 14 (*3rd Sun. in Advent*)	At Denmark House to Queen Anne.
„ 1	161$\frac{7}{8}$ Feb. 20 (*1st Fri. in Lent*)	At Whitehall.
„ 12	1618 Ap. 12 (*1st Sun after Easter*)	„ „
„ 13	„ Ap. 19 (*2nd Sun. after Easter*)	„ „
„ 2	161$\frac{8}{9}$ Feb. 12 (*1st Fri. in Lent*)	„ „
lxxx, 27[3]	1619 *Mar.* 28 (Easter Sun.)	'To the Lords upon Easter-day, at the Communion, The King being then dangerously sick at New-Market.'
xxvi, 19	„ Ap. 18 (*3rd Sun. after Easter*)	At Lincoln's Inn. 'A Sermon of Valediction at my going into Germany.'
„ 20	„ June 16	'Two Sermons, to the Prince and Princess Palatine, the Lady Elizabeth at Heydelberg, when I was commanded by the King to wait upon my L. of Doncaster in his Embassage to Germany. First Sermon as we went out[4].'
lxxx, 71 & 72	„ Dec. 19 (*4th Sun. in Advent*)	At the Hague. 'Since in my sicknesse at Abreyhatche in Essex, 1630, revising my short notes of that Sermon, I digested them into these two.'
„ 14	161$\frac{9}{20}$ March 3 (*1st Fri. in Lent*)	At Whitehall.
xxvi, 9[5]	1620 Ap. 2 (*5th Sun. in Lent*)	„ „

[1] This is the earliest of Donne's sermons which we possess, for L, 35, which is headed Feb. 21, 1611, must be incorrectly dated, as Donne was not ordained till Jan. 161$\frac{4}{5}$.

[2] If L, 48 is the sermon on Lam. iii. 1 mentioned by Walton as Donne's first after his wife's death, it must belong to Aug. 1617 and should be inserted here.

[3] The heading of this sermon does not give the year, but the mention of the King's illness at Newmarket points conclusively to 1619.

[4] The second sermon to the Prince and Princess Palatine has apparently been lost.

[5] Numbered erroneously as 10 in the 166$\frac{9}{1}$ edition, no. 9 being omitted, and this and the following sermon (which is on the same text) being both numbered as 10. I believe

Vol. and No.	Date	Place and Occasion
LXXX, 74	1620 Ap. 30 (*2nd Sun. after Easter*)	At Whitehall.
„ 42	„ *June* 11 (Trinity Sunday)	At Lincoln's Inn.
L, 30	$162\frac{0}{1}$ Jan. 7 (*1st Sun. after Epiphany*)	'To the Countesse of Bedford, then at Harrington house.'
XXVI, 4	„ Feb. 16 (*1st Fri. in Lent*)	Before the King at Whitehall.
„ 14[1]	1621 Ap. 2 (*Easter Monday*)	At Whitehall.
LXXX, 70	„ Ap. 8 (*1st Sun. after Easter*)	„ „
L, 36	„ *Dec.* 25 (Christmas Day)	At St Paul's.
LXXX, 15	$162\frac{1}{2}$ Mar. 8 (*1st Fri. in Lent*)	At Whitehall.
XXVI, 25	$162\frac{2}{3}$ *Ap.* 22 (Easter Monday)	At the Spital.
„ 23	„ *May* 30 (Ascension Day)	At Lincoln's Inn.
L, 37	„ *June* 24 (Midsummer Day)	At St Paul's.
„ 31	„ Aug. 25 (*10th Sun. after Trinity*)	'At Hanworth, to my Lord of Carlile, and his company, being the Earles of Northumberland, and Buckingham, etc.'
Published separately in 1622	„ Sept. 15 (*13th Sun. after Trinity*)	The Cross (i.e. St Paul's Cross). 'Wherein occasion was justly taken for the publication of some reasons, which His Sacred Majesty had been pleased to give, of those Directions for Preachers, which he had formerly sent forth.'
L, 38	„ Oct. 13 (*17th Sun. after Trinity*)	At St Paul's.
„ 43	„ Nov. 5	'The Anniversary celebration of our Deliverance from the Powder Treason. Intended for Pauls Crosse, but by reason of the weather, Preached in the Church.'
Published separately in 1622	„ Nov. 13	Preached to the Honourable Company of the Virginian Plantation.
LXXX, 1	„ *Dec.* 25 (Christmas Day)	At St Paul's.
„ 16	$162\frac{2}{3}$ *Feb.* 28 (1st Fri. in Lent)	At Whitehall.
„ 18	1623 *Ap.* 13 (Easter Day)	At St Paul's, 'in the Evening.'
Published separately in 1623	„ *May* 22 (Ascension Day)	'Encœnia. The Feast of Dedication Celebrated At Lincolnes Inne...At the Dedication of a new Chappell there.'
LXXX, 19	1624 *Mar.* 28 (Easter Day)	At St Paul's...'in the Evening.'
L, 45	„ Ap. 11 (*2nd Sun. after Easter*)	At St Dunstan's. 'The first Sermon in that Church, as Vicar thereof.'
„ 46	„ Ap. 25 (*4th Sun. after Easter*)	'The second Sermon Preached by the Author after he came to St Dunstanes.'
LXXX, 43	„ *May* 23 (Trinity Sunday)	At St Dunstan's.

that Sermon 10, which is clearly a continuation of 9, though undated, should be inserted here, as it probably followed at an interval of one or two weeks.

[1] This sermon is evidently a continuation of XXVI, 13 which is dated Ap. 19, 1618, since it is called 'A Second Sermon preached at Whitehall' and allusion is made in it to the foregoing one. It is difficult to believe that Donne would have reminded his hearers of a sermon preached three years before. One of the two dates is probably incorrect.

Vol. and No.	Date	Place and Occasion
L, 32	1624 June 13 (*3rd Sun. after Trinity*)	'To the Earl of Exeter, and his company, in his Chappell at Saint Johns.'
LXXX, 2	„ *Dec.* 25 (Christmas Day)	At St Paul's, 'in the Evening.'
L, 49	$162\frac{4}{5}$ Jan. 1 (*Circumcision*)	At St Dunstan's.
LXXX, 46[1]	„ *Jan.* 30 (*4th Sun. after Epiphany*)	'At S. Paul's, The Sunday after the Conversion of S. Paul, 1624.'
„ 17	„ Mar. 4 (*1st Fri. in Lent*)	At Whitehall.
Published separately in 1625	1625 Ap. 3 (*5th Sun. in Lent*)	'The First Sermon preached to King Charles, At Saint James.'
LXXX, 20	„ *Ap.* 17 (Easter Day)	At St Paul's, 'in the Evening.'
L, 33	„ Ap. 26	'At Denmark house, some few days before the body of King James was removed from thence, to his buriall, Ap. 26, 1625.'
LXXX, 65	„ May 8 (*3rd Sun. after Easter*)	At St Paul's. 'The first of the Prebend of Cheswicks five Psalmes.'
„ 3	„ *Dec.* 25 (Christmas Day)	At St Paul's.
XXVI, 21	$162\frac{5}{6}$ Jan. 15 (*2nd Sun. after Epiphany*)	At St Dunstan's. 'The First Sermon after Our Dispersion by the Sickness.'
LXXX, 66	„ Jan. 29 (*4th Sun. after Epiphany*)	At St Paul's. 'The second of my Prebend Sermons upon my five Psalmes.'
Published separately in 1626	„ Feb. 24 (*1st Fri. in Lent*)	'A Sermon Preached to the Kings M^tie^ at Whitehall.'
LXXX, 21	1626 *Ap.* 9 (Easter Day)	'The first Sermon upon this Text, preached at S. Pauls, in the Evening.'
„ 73	„ Ap. 18	'Preached to the King in my Ordinary wayting at Whitehall.'
XXVI, 8	„ Ap. 30 (*3rd Sun. after Easter*)	To the Household at Whitehall.
LXXX, 77	„ May 21 (*Sun. after Ascension Day*)	At St Paul's.
„ 78	„ June 21	„ „
„ 67	„ Nov. 5	St Paul's '*In Vesperis.*' 'The third of my Prebend Sermons upon my five Psalmes.'
„ 80	„ Dec. 12	'Preached at the funerals of Sir William Cokayne, Knight, Alderman of London.'
„ 4	„ *Dec.* 25 (Christmas Day)	At St Paul's.
„ 68	$162\frac{6}{7}$ Jan. 28 (*Sexagesima Sun.*)	„ „ 'The fourth of my Prebend Sermons upon my five Psalmes.'
„ 22	1627 *Mar.* 25 (Easter Day)	At St Paul's.

[1] It is possible that this sermon should be dated $162\frac{6}{7}$, since in LXXX, 49 (preached on the Conversion of St Paul $16\frac{2}{30}$) Donne alludes to this and the two following sermons (dated $162\frac{7}{8}$ and $162\frac{8}{9}$) and says, 'In which respect, at this time of the yeare, and in these dayes when the Church commemorates the Conversion of S. Paul, I have, *for divers yeares successively*, in this place, determined my selfe upon this Book' [i.e., Acts]. He then enumerates the texts on which LXXX, 46, 47, 48 had been preached.

Vol. and No.	Date	Place and Occasion
L, 27	1627 Ap. 1 (*1st Sun. after Easter*)	To the King, at Whitehall.
„ 41	„ May 6 (*Sun. after Ascension Day*)	At St Paul's Cross.
LXXX, 28	„ *May* 13 (Whitsunday)	At St Paul's.
„ 44	„ *May* 20 (Trinity Sunday)	At St Dunstan's.
Published separately in 1627	„ July 1 (*6th Sun. after Trinity*)	'A Sermon of Commemoration of the Lady Danvers, late Wife of Sir John Danvers. Preached at Chilsey [i.e. Chelsea] where she was lately buried.'
L, 1	„ Nov. 19	'At the Earl of Bridgewaters house in London at the mariage of his daughter, the Lady Mary, to the eldest sonne of the L. Herbert of Castle-island.'
LXXX, 5	„ *Dec.* 25 (Christmas Day)	At St Paul's.
„ 47	$162\frac{7}{8}$ Jan. 27 (*3rd Sun. after Epiphany*)	'At S. Paul's, The Sunday after the Conversion of S. Paul.'
XXVI, 15	„ Feb. 29 (*1st Fri. in Lent*)	At Whitehall.
LXXX, 54	1628 Ap. 5	'To the King at Whitehall, upon the occasion of the Fast.'
„ 23	„ *Ap.* 13 (Easter Day)	At St Paul's.
„ 75	„ Ap. 15 (*Easter Tuesday*)	'To the King at Whitehall.'
„ 29	„ *June* 1 (Whitsunday)	At St Paul's.
L, 42	„ Nov. 23 (*24th Sun. after Trinity*)	St Paul's 'in the Evening[1].'
LXXX, 6	„ *Dec.* 25 (Christmas Day)	At St Paul's.
„ 48	$162\frac{8}{9}$ Jan. 25 (Conversion of St Paul)	'At S. Pauls in the Evening, Vpon the day of S. Paul's Conversion, 1628.'
XXVI, 3[2]	„ Feb. 20 (*1st Fri. in Lent*)	At Whitehall.
L, 28[3]	1629 Ap. —	'Preached to the King, at the Court in April, 1629.'
LXXX, 24	„ *Ap.* 5 (Easter Day)	Probably at St Paul's (no place given).
„ 31	„ *May* 24 (Whitsunday)	At St Paul's.
L, 44	„ Nov. 22 (*25th Sun. after Trinity*)	At St Paul's Cross.
LXXX, 49	$16\frac{29}{30}$ *Jan.* 25[4] (Conv. of St Paul)	At St Paul's.
XXVI, 5[5]	„ Feb. 12 (*1st Fri. in Lent*)	To the King at Whitehall.
LXXX, 25	1630 *Mar.* 28 (Easter Day)	At St Paul's.
„ 13	„ Ap. 20	[6] 'Preached in Lent, to the King.'

[1] This is the heading of the sermon, though the pages are headed 'At Saint Pauls Crosse.'

[2] This sermon is repeated as XXVI, 17, where no date is given.

[3] Before its appearance in the *L Sermons*, this was published in 1634 by the University of Cambridge as one of *Six Sermons upon Severall Occasions* preached by Donne.

[4] Should this sermon be dated Jan. 24 or 31 (the Sundays preceding and following the Feast of St Paul's Conv.) rather than Jan. 25, the actual date of the Feast? See Donne's remarks on his habit of celebrating festivals on the Sunday preceding or following, in LXXX, 47. The place is not mentioned in the title, but from Donne's words 'I have, for divers yeares successively, *in this place*, determined my selfe upon this Book,' it is clear that the sermon was preached at St Paul's.

[5] This sermon is repeated as XXVI, 16, where the date is given as Feb. 22. Since that date fell on a Monday, it is evident that XXVI, 5 gives the correct date, the first Friday in Lent being, as Walton tells us, Donne's 'old constant day.'

[6] There is an error in this title, for in 1630 Easter fell on March 28, so that Ap. 20 could not possibly have been in Lent. Gosse dates the sermon Ap. 23 and adds a footnote

Vol. and No.	Date	Place and Occasion
xxvi, 26 (published separately in 1632 as 'Death's Duel')	$163\frac{9}{1}$ *Feb.* 25[1] (1st Fri. in Lent)	At Whitehall before the King.

Conjectural and approximate dates.

lxxx, 7. 'Preached upon Christmas Day.' If Gosse is correct in his statement 'For the first time since he [Donne] was appointed Dean, he was not able to preach in his Cathedral on Christmas Day, 1629[2],' this sermon must belong to Christmas Day in one of the years 1615–1620. A few pages later, however, Gosse states, referring to 1630, 'For the first time in twenty years, he did not even preach before the King at Christmas[3].' In the absence of evidence corroborating Gosse's former statement, I am inclined by internal evidence to ascribe this sermon to Christmas 1629. It is clearly not the work of a man who has just entered the Church, and if it belongs to the 1615–1620[4] period, must be ascribed to the end of it.

lxxx, 9. 'Preached upon Candlemas day.' The heading of this sermon tells us that the text (Rom. xiii. 7) formed 'part of the Epistle of that day, that yeare.' The text occurs in the Epistle for the Fourth Sunday after Epiphany, and the sermon must therefore belong to Feb. 2nd, $161\frac{6}{7}$, or $162\frac{2}{3}$, those being the only years during Donne's ministry in which the Fourth Sunday after Epiphany fell on Feb. 2nd. Of the two dates, $162\frac{2}{3}$ seems to me to be preferable.

lxxx, 10. 'Preached upon Candlemas day.' At the beginning of this sermon Donne says, alluding to his text (Rom. xii. 20), 'It falls out...that those Scriptures which are appointed to be read in the Church, all these dayes, (for I take no other this Terme) doe evermore afford, and offer us Texts, that direct us to patience.' This indicates that Donne was preaching in the week of the Third Sunday after Epiphany, in the Epistle for which this text is found. The only years during Donne's ministry in which Candlemas Day fell in this week were $162\frac{1}{2}$ and $162\frac{7}{8}$. References in the sermon to 'the miseries of our

'Misprinted "April 20" in the 1640 edition (p. 127). Dr Jessopp points out that the third Sunday after Easter fell on the 23rd' (*Life and Letters of John Donne*, II, p. 263). This emendation only increases the confusion, for as a matter of fact, Ap. 23 was a Friday, and moreover was not in Lent.

[1] The *XXVI Sermons* give no date for this sermon, but Walton tells us that it was preached on the 1st Fri. in Lent. The separate edition (1632) says that it was delivered 'in the beginning of Lent 1630' [i.e. $163\frac{9}{1}$].

[2] *Life and Letters of John Donne*, Vol. II, p. 262.

[3] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 266. 'Twenty years' must be used here somewhat loosely, as Donne was not ordained till 1615.

[4] 1619 is impossible, as Donne was then on the Continent with Doncaster's embassy.

brethren round about us,' and 'the aimes and plots of our adversaries upon us' (p. 97) make the year $162\frac{1}{2}$ seem probable, as men's minds were then much disturbed by the sufferings of the Protestants in Germany.

LXXX, 11. 'Preached upon Candlemas day.' The last sentence runs 'And therefore since all the world shakes in a palsie of wars, and rumours of wars, since we are sure that Christs Vicar in this case will come to his *Dimittuntur peccata*, to send his Buls, and Indulgences, and Crociatars for the maintenance of his part, in that cause, let us also, who are to do the duties of private men, to obey and not to direct, by presenting our diseased and paralytique souls to Christ Jesus, now, when he in the Ministry of his unworthiest servant is preaching unto you,...let us endeavour to bring him to his *Dimittuntur peccata*, to forgive us all those sins, which are the true causes of all our palsies, and slacknesses in his service; and so, without limiting him, or his great Vicegerents, and Lieutenants, the way, or the time, to beg of him, that he will imprint in them, such counsels and such resolutions, as his wisdome knows best to conduce to his glory, and the maintenance of his Gospell.' This might refer to the agitation felt in England over the defeat of the Elector Palatine at Prague in October, 1620. Public opinion was strongly in favour of war; men were anxious that James I should take up arms on behalf of his son-in-law the Elector, and thus defend the Protestant cause on the Continent against that of Roman Catholicism.

Thus Feb. 2, $162\frac{0}{1}$, seems a probable date for this sermon. If LXXX, 10 is correctly dated as belonging to Feb. 2, $162\frac{1}{2}$, and LXXX, 9 as Feb. 2, $162\frac{2}{3}$, these years are excluded. Feb. 2, $162\frac{3}{4}$, is excluded by Donne's illness at that time. Feb. 2, $162\frac{4}{5}$, is also a possible date.

LXXX, 26. 'Preached upon Easter-day.' It was Donne's duty as Dean of St Paul's to preach in the Cathedral on Easter Day. He was elected Dean in November, 1621, and we possess Easter sermons preached at St Paul's for 1623 and all the succeeding years of his life. This sermon probably belongs therefore to Easter 1622.

LXXX, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37. 'Preached upon Whitsunday.'

As Dean Donne was required to preach at St Paul's on Whitsunday. We have sermons for 1627, 1628, and 1629 (LXXX, 28, 29, 31). Six of these sermons may therefore be assigned to the Whitsundays of 1622, 1623, 1624, 1625, 1626, 1630. There would then remain one sermon not accounted for. This might be LXXX, 30, which is inserted between the Whitsunday sermons of 1628 and 1629. In this case

LXXX, 32 would probably belong to 1630, as it follows LXXX, 31 which is dated 1629, and LXXX, 33–37 might form a series for the years 1622–1626. This is made more likely by the relation between LXXX, 36 and 37, which are on the same text and were probably preached on successive Whitsundays (cf. LXXX, 28 and 29, which were both preached on John xiv. 26, and are dated Whitsunday 1627, and Whitsunday 1628 respectively).

LXXX, 38, 39, 40, 41. 'Preached upon Trinity Sunday.' A careful examination of these sermons shows that they form a course, announced by Donne in no. 38, as intended to deal, not in a controversial spirit but in one of devotion and edification, with the Three Persons of the Trinity and with sins directed against each Person. No. 38 takes as its subject God the Father, no. 39 sins directed specially against Him, no. 40 God the Son, and no. 41 sins directed specially against Him. Donne's introductory words in no. 38 indicate that the course was preached at Lincoln's Inn not on separate Trinity Sundays, but on successive Sundays after Trinity during the summer term[1]. It was Donne's duty as Reader of Lincoln's Inn—a post which he held from October, 1616, to February, 1622—to preach 'every Sabbath day in the term, both forenoon and afternoon, and once the Sabbath days before and after every term, and on the Grand Days every forenoon.' We possess a sermon preached at Lincoln's Inn on Trinity Sunday 1620 (LXXX, 42) and in 1619 Donne was in Germany with Doncaster's embassy. Thus it seems that this course of sermons should be ascribed to the Trinity season of 1617, 1618, or 1621, and of these dates 1621 is, in my opinion, to be preferred.

LXXX, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55. 'Preached upon the Penitentiall Psalmes.'

These form a series on Psalm vi. with LXXX, 54, which is headed 'Preached to the King at White-hall, upon the occasion of the Fast, April 5, 1628.' Hence it is probable that LXXX, 50–53 were preached in 1627, $162\frac{7}{8}$, and LXXX, 55 in 1628.

LXXX, 69. 'The fifth of my Prebend Sermons upon my five Psalmes: Preached at S. Pauls.'

This must be later than Jan. 28, $162\frac{6}{7}$, when the fourth of Donne's prebend sermons was preached (LXXX, 68). The prebend sermons followed one another at intervals of a few months, so this sermon may be safely assigned to 1627.

[1] 'I have bent my meditations, for those dayes, which this Terme will afford, upon that, which is the character and mark of all Christians in generall, the Trinity, the three Persons in one God.' LXXX, 38, p. 376. Had the sermon been preached anywhere but at Lincoln's Inn, Donne would hardly have mentioned the Term.

LXXX, 76. 'Preached to the Earle of Carlile, and his Company, at Sion.'

Viscount Doncaster was created Earl of Carlisle in September, 1622, so the sermon was probably preached after that date.

LXXX, 79. 'Preached at S. Pauls.'

Political references in this sermon seem to date it as belonging to 1620–1622.

E.g. 'I may have a full measure in my selfe, finde no want of temporall conveniencies, or spirituall consolation even in inconveniencies, and so hold up a holy alacrity and cheerefulnesse for all concerning my selfe, and yet see God abandon greater persons, and desert some whole Churches, and States, upon whom his glory and Gospel depends much more then upon me, but this is a prayer of charitable extension, *Satura nos*, not *me*, but *us*, all us that professe thee aright[1].'

'But he may derive help upon us, by meanes that are not his, not avowed by him. He may quicken our Counsels by bringing in an *Achitophell*, he may strengthen our Armies by calling in the Turke, he may establish our peace and friendships, by remitting or departing with some parts of our Religion; at such a deare price we may be helped, but these are not his helps[2].'

'God does all that he can for us; And therefore when we see others in distresse, whether nationall, or personall calamities, whether Princes be dispossest of their naturall patrimony, and inheritance, or private persons afflicted with sicknesse, or penury, or banishment, let us goe Gods way, all the way[3].'

'Our Ancestors who indured many yeares Civill and forraine wars, were more affected with their first peace, then we are with our continuall enjoying thereof, And our Fathers more thankfull, for the beginning of Reformation of Religion, then we for so long enjoying the continuance thereof[4].'

The references here are probably to Frederick, Elector Palatine, and his expulsion from the Palatinate. In 1620 James I was moved to anger by a rumour that Frederick had invited the Turks into Hungary to help him in his Bohemian campaign[5]. Feeling in England ran high in favour of Frederick, and great impatience was manifested at the reluctance of James to assist his son-in-law.

L, 8. 'Preached at Essex House, at the Churching of the Lady Doncaster.'

[1] LXXX, 79, p. 805.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 806.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 808.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 811.
[5] Tillieres' despatch, April $\frac{6}{16}$, Raumer, *Briefe aus Paris*, II, 299, as quoted by S. R. Gardiner, *History of England*, 1603–1642, Vol. III, p. 344.

Doncaster married, as his second wife, Lucy Percy, daughter of the Earl of Northumberland. The marriage took place in November, 1617. Doncaster was created Earl of Carlisle in Sept. 1622. This sermon therefore belongs probably to 1618–1622. From May, 1619 to Jan. 1620 Doncaster and Donne were abroad on the Bohemian Embassy. It seems therefore that 1618 is the most probable date for this sermon.

L, 9. 'Preached at a Churching.'

10. 'Preached at the Churching of the Countesse of Bridgewater.'

These two sermons have the same text, and the second is evidently a continuation of the first, if indeed the two do not form one sermon, divided by Donne when he revised his notes, as we know to have been the case with LXXX, 71 and 72[1].

The Earl and Countess of Bridgewater had a numerous family, consisting of four sons and eleven daughters, of whom two sons and three daughters died in infancy. The occasion of L, 10 must have been afforded by the birth of one of the younger members of the family, perhaps that of John[2] (born 1622), the eldest surviving son, who succeeded to the title in 1649. The sermon cannot be later than 1623, when the youngest child of the Earl and Countess was born.

L, 11. 'Preached at Lincolns Inne, preparing them to build their Chappell.'

This sermon must belong to 1617 when the foundation stone of the new Chapel was laid.

L, 12–23. 'Preached at Lincolns Inne.'

These sermons evidently belong to the period during which Donne held the office of Reader at Lincoln's Inn (Oct. 1616–Feb. 162½), a post which involved, so Dr Jessopp computes, the preaching of not less than fifty sermons a year. During term he was required to preach twice every Sunday.

Of this group nos. 12 and 13 are closely connected and were apparently preached on the same day, one in the morning and the other in the evening[3]. Donne's words in no. 13 imply that he had already been Reader for more than a year[4].

[1] The conjecture that the two sermons are really one is supported by the absence of any reference in L, 9 to the occasion on which it was preached.

[2] John, Viscount Brackley, played the part of the Elder Brother in the performance of Milton's *Comus* at Ludlow Castle in 1634.

[3] These two also appeared in 1634 in the *Six Sermons*.

[4] 'In such an appearance doth this Text differ from that which I handled in the forenoon, and as heretofore I found it a usefull and acceptable labour, to employ our Evening exercises upon the vindicating of some such places of Scripture, as our adversaries of the Roman Church had detorted in some point of controversie between them and us, and restoring those places to their true sense, (which course I held constantly for one

Nos. 14 and 15 are similarly connected.

No. 16 may be one of the course of controversial sermons mentioned in no. 13. If so it preceded nos. 13–15, and must have been preached in an earlier term.

Nos. 17 and 18 both take as their text St Matt. xviii. 7 and no. 18 is evidently a continuation of no. 17. It is probable that they belong to the winter of 1620–1, for there are passages in no. 18 which seem to point to the dismay in England at the news of the Elector Palatine's defeat at Prague, and to the general impatience for war on his behalf[1].

Nos. 19–23 form a series preached on Ps. xxxviii., and of these nos. 21–23 take ver. 4 as their text.

L, 26. 'Preached to the King, at White-Hall, the first Sunday in Lent.'

$162\frac{6}{7}$ seems a probable date for this sermon, as that is the only year from $161\frac{7}{8}$ till Donne's death for which we possess no sermon preached at Whitehall on the first Friday in Lent. (There is no sermon for $162\frac{3}{4}$, when Donne was recovering from his dangerous illness.) It is hardly probable that the King would have ordered Donne to preach before him on the 1st Sunday in Lent as well as on the 1st Friday.

L, 29[2]. 'Preached to the King, at the Court.' This is evidently a continuation of L, 28 which was preached to the King in April 1629 on the same text, Gen. i. 26.

L, 47, 48, 50. 'Preached at St Dunstans.' These sermons probably belong to the period when Donne was Vicar of St Dunstan's. He preached his first sermon there as vicar on Ap. 11, 1624.

No. 47 is headed 'An Anniversary Sermon preached at St Dunstans,

whole year) so I think it a usefull and acceptable labour, now to employ for a time those Evening exercises to reconcile some such places of Scripture, as may at first sight seem to differ from one another; In the morning we saw how Christ judged all [no. 12 has as its text "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son"]; now we are to see how he judges none: *I judge no man.*' L, 13, p. 101.

[1] Speaking of the man who is easily scandalized, Donne says 'Hee stays not to give men their Law, to give Princes, and States time to consider, whether it may not be fit for them to come to leagues, and alliances, and declarations for the assistance of the Cause of Religion next year, though not this. But *continuo scandalizatur*, as soon as a *Catholique army* hath given a blow, and got a victory of any of our forces, or friends, or as soon as a *crafty Jesuit* hath forged a Relation, that that Army hath given such a blow, or that such an Army there is, (for many times they intimidate weake men, when they shoote nothing but Paper, when they are onely *Paper-Armies*, and *Pamphlet-Victories*, and no such in truth) *Illico scandalizatur*, yet with these forged rumours, presently hee is scandalized.' L, 18, p. 147.

Prof. S. R. Gardiner says 'The first news of Frederick's defeat reached London on November 24 [1620]. The agitation was great. It was easy to see that, in their hearts, the citizens laid the blame of all that had taken place upon the King. Not a few took refuge in incredulity. The story, it was said, had come through Brussels, and had probably been invented by the Papists. Many days passed before the unwelcome news was accepted." *History of England*, 1603–1642, vol. III, p. 385.

[2] Also published in 1634 in the *Six Sermons*.

upon the commemoration of a Parishioner, a Benefactor to that Parish.'

No. 48 has as its text Lam. iii. 1. 'I am the man that hath seen affliction by the rod of his wrath.' This is the text on which, according to Walton, Donne preached his first sermon after his wife's death. On this evidence Gosse[1] has identified this sermon with the one described by Walton, though the latter expressly states that the one to which he refers was preached 'where his [Donne's] beloved wife lay buried—in St Clement's Church, near Temple Bar, London,' whereas L, 48 is headed 'Preached at St Dunstans' and is included among a number of sermons preached at that church. It is possible, of course, that Gosse is right in regarding Walton's statement as one of his numerous inaccuracies, or the heading of L, 48 may be incorrect; on the other hand, as Gosse has remarked, there is nothing in L, 48 which has any clear reference to Donne's bereavement, or makes it in any sense a funeral sermon[2]. During his ministry Donne preached an enormous number of sermons, and it is possible that the sermon described by Walton has not been preserved, and that as Vicar of St Dunstan's, at least seven years having elapsed since his wife's death, Donne used the same text and treated it somewhat differently.

In no. 50 Donne refers to a previous sermon on the text 'Jesus wept[3].' We possess a sermon (LXXX, 16) on this text preached at Whitehall on the first Friday in Lent (Feb. 28) $162\frac{2}{3}$.

XXVI, 10. This is a continuation of XXVI, 9 (also numbered as 10, no. 9 being omitted in the *XXVI Sermons*) which is dated Ap. 2, 1620. This sermon may therefore safely be dated as belonging to 1620.

Thus there remain only the few following Sermons to which as yet no date can be assigned. Further investigation will probably lessen their number still further.

LXXX, 8.	'Preached upon Candlemas Day.'
12.	'Preached upon Candlemas Day.'
30.	'Preached upon Whitsunday.'
45.	'Preached upon All-Saints Day.'

[1] *Life and Letters of John Donne*, II, p. 94.

[2] Walton says, 'And indeed his very words and looks testified him to be truly such a man ["as had seen affliction"]; and they, with the addition of his sighs and tears, expressed in his sermon, did so work upon the affections of his hearers as melted and moulded them into a companionable sadness.'

[3] 'We reade in the Naturall Story, of some floating Islands, that swim, and move from place to place; and in them a Man may sowe in one place, and reape in another: This case is so farre ours, as that in another place we have sowed in tears, and by his promise, in whose tears we sowed them, when we handled those two words, *Jesus wept*, we shall reape in Joy.' p. 466.

LXXX, 56—64. 'Preached upon the Penitentiall Psalmes' (56—63 form a series on Ps. xxxii).
L, 2, 3[1]. 'Preached at a Mariage.'
4—7. 'Preached at a Christning.'
24, 25. 'Preached at White-Hall.'
34. 'To the Nobility.'
35[2]. 'To the Nobility. Preached February 21. 1611.' This must be an error, as Donne was not ordained till Jan. $161\frac{4}{5}$.
39, 40. 'Preached at Saint Pauls.'
XXVI, 22. 'Preached at the Temple.'

EVELYN M. SPEARING.

CAMBRIDGE.

[1] No. 3 also appeared in 1634 in the *Six Sermons*.
[2] Also published in the *Six Sermons*.

NOTES ON ROMANIC SPEECH-HISTORY.

In order to describe the development of certain Romanic sounds, it will be necessary to employ a number of special symbols, in addition to the well-known Spanish *ñ*, Bohemian *š* and *ž*. Those that need explaining are χ^1 γ^2 velar fricatives; ξ^1 y^2 prepalatal fricatives; κ^1 ϱ^2 prepalatal occlusives; θ^1 δ^2 dental fricatives; λ = Portuguese *lh*; η = English final *ng*. The letter *y* is also used for the slightly opener non-fricative sound heard in English *year*. As French fricative *y* in *brille* and non-fricative *y* in *vaillant* are not distinguished in ordinary transcriptions, either by native or foreign writers, I trust that I may be pardoned for a similar vagueness in cases where the exact sound cannot be known[3].

*Cinctulu.

It used to be thought that Sp. *vergüenza* contained normal $z < dy$; Baist is unwilling to give up this theory[4], which is as unreasonable as his spelling *verguenza*[5]. It seems to be established that the Sp. derivative of $\tilde{n}\varrho$ varied with the position of stress[6]: hence it follows that the variant *vergüeña* (= Pt. *vergonha* = It. *vergogna*) is the normal representative of *uerecundia*[7]. The older form of *vergüenza* (= Pt. *vergonça*) had *ç*[8], which cannot represent *dy*; evidently this *ç*

[1] Voiceless. [2] Voiced.

[3] Abbreviations. *Alb.*: Pekmezi, *Grammatik der albanesischen Sprache*, Wien, 1908; *Altb.*: Leskien, *Handbuch der altbulgarischen Sprache*, Weimar, 1898; *Altfr.*: Schwan-Behrens, *Grammatik des Altfranzösischen*, Leipzig, 1907; *Altsp.*: Zauner, *Altspanisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg, 1908; *Ast.*: Munthe, *Anteckningar om folkmålet i en trakt af vestra Asturien*, Upsala, 1887; *Ctl.*: Fabra, *Contribució a la gramatica de la llengua catalana*, Barcelona, 1898; *Eng.*: Sweet, *A History of English Sounds*, Oxford, 1888; *Esp.*: Menéndez Pidal, *Manual elemental de gramática histórica española*, Madrid, 1905. *Frn.*: Passy, *Les Sons du français*, Paris, 1899; *Gr.*: Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, I, Strassburg, 1906; *Ir.*: Windisch, *A Concise Irish Grammar*, Cambridge, 1882; *Ltn.*: Stolz-Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*, München, 1910; *Mhd.*: Paul, *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*, Halle, 1900; *Phn.*: Viëtor, *Elemente der Phonetik*, Leipzig, 1898; *Prt.*: Vianna, *Exposição da pronuncia normal portuguesa*, Lisboa, 1892; *Rmn.*: Titkin, *Rumänisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg, 1905; *Spn.*: Ford, *The Old Spanish Sibilants*, Boston, 1900; *Urg.*: Streitberg, *Urgermanische Grammatik*, Heidelberg, 1896. Fr.: French; It.: Italian; Pt.: Portuguese; Pv.: Provençal; Rm.: Rumanian; Sp.: Spanish.

[4] *Gr.*, 900. [5] *Gr.*, 888 and 900. [6] *Esp.*, 86.

[7] *Modern Philology*, VIII, 595. [8] *Spn.*, 44.

may be ascribed to the influence of the common abstract-ending *-nça* < *-ntia*[1]. It ought not to be needful to insist on this fact; but several writers disregard it and imagine that a voiceless resultant, in the medieval Hispanic tongues, can somehow be obtained from a voiced sound-group. In the second edition of his grammar, Menéndez Pidal still assumes that early Sp. *ç* (= *ts*) can come from *dy* or *ddy*[2]; and this mistake has recently been repeated by Millardet[3]. In the same work Menéndez Pidal derives *cincho* from *cingulu*[4] and mentions *uña* only to leave it a mystery. Likewise Zauner clings to the *cingulu*-theory[5] and ignores the disagreement with *uña* < *ungula*, which is really a normal development[6]. Cornu treats Pt. *ç* as the regular derivative of *dy* in *ouço* (for **oivo* < *audio*) and other verbs[7], where it is analogic, presumably due to the influence of *faço*. These eminent scholars overlook an important fact: it is one thing for a voiceless sound to stay voiceless, as in *braço* = It. *braccio*, *mancha* = It. *macchia*; and a very different thing for a voiced sound to become voiceless. Of course the latter change may result from assimilation: the derivatives of *kl* have become entirely voiceless in Sp. *mancha* and Pt. *mancha*. But a general loss of voicing between voiced sounds, as in Castilian-Galician *x*[8] (= *š*) for medieval *j* (= *ž*), is a late development with few Romanic parallels outside of Spain, and none in early Hispanic. Italian has *cintolo* < **cinctulu*; Sp. *cincho* (= Pt. *cincho*?) must be derived from this diminutive, which was apparently formed from *cinctu* under the influence of *cingulu*. The development of *tl*, after a consonant, agrees with Sp. *macho* = Pt. *macho* < *martulu*, the original *t* of this stem being kept in Sp. *marti(e)llo* = Pt. *martelo* < *martellu*. The word *cingulu* is the source of Sp. *ceño*, at least for the meaning 'hoop,' and presumably of Pt. *cenho*, which has some of the other meanings of the Spanish word; the *e* corresponds to that of Sp. *seños* (with the variant *sendos*, explained in *Modern Philology*, VIII, 596) = Pt. *senhos* < *singulos*.

Laicu.

Latin *laicu* makes Sp. *lego* and Pt. *leigo*. It is assumed by Millardet that *lego* was developed from dissyllabic **layku*[9]. This idea can hardly be maintained, so long as we admit the existence of sound-laws. In Sp. *coto* = Pt. *couto* < *cautu*, Sp. *poco* = Pt. *pouco* < *paucu*, no voiced sounds were formed like those of *segada* < *secata*, because *w* was just

[1] *Spn.*, 45; *Altsp.*, 48.
[2] *Esp.*, 92.
[3] *Romania*, XLI, 250.
[4] *Esp.*, 105.
[5] *Altsp.*, 46.
[6] *Modern Philology*, VIII, 595.
[7] *Gr.*, 960.
[8] *Modern Philology*, IV, 280.
[9] *Romania*, XLI, 249.

as much a consonant as *l* in *altu* > *alto* or *n* in *tantu* > *tanto*. Since *w* had the effect of a consonant, it is plain that *y* would have had the same effect. It is commonly held that a transposed *y* protected *p* in Sp. *sepa* < *sapiat*, but perhaps it is better not to lay too much weight on this supposed example: It. *sappia* and Catalan *sápiga*[1] show that the Sp. form may have a different explanation. A clearer case is Sp. *mitad* < *meytad* (= Pt. *metade*) < **meytade* < **meytate* < **meyetate*; this evidently parallels Sp. *poco* = Pt. *pouco*, and makes *g* < *k* impossible in *lego* and *leigo*, if we start from **layko* or **layku*. We must therefore conclude that *laicu* made **laigo* or **laëgo* with three syllables, whence *leigo* and *lego*. That is, the derivative of dissyllabic *ai*, which was extremely rare in popular Latin, did not become monosyllabic until after the voicing of occlusives in Hispanic. It might be supposed that Sp. *aire* < *aëre* makes *lego* < **laëgo* impossible; but this is by no means certain. We can assume **laëgo* > **laygo* contemporary with unchanged *aëre* > *aëre*, whence later Sp. **leygo* beside *aire*. The influence of *r* in producing or protecting open vowels is found in nearly all Romanic tongues: it is regressive in Pt. *ar* < *aëre*, Sp. *barrer* < *uerrere*, Asturian *ñeru* = Sp. *nido* < *nīdu*, Fr. *par* < *per*, progressive in Rm. *întreg* < *integru* beside normal *pierd* < *perdo*.

Lignu.

Anyone who takes the trouble to look into the history of Latin sounds can see that written GN must have been pronounced *ηn* medially. Original *e* becomes *i* before *ηk* and *ηg*[2], and also before the sound-group spelled GN[3]. Stressed *e* is kept before *g*, for example in *lego* and *rego*, notwithstanding the *i* of *colligo* and *erigo*, which would have strengthened a tendency to form stressed *i* before *g*, if such a tendency had existed. Since *e* is kept before oral *g*, it is hard to understand why *e* became *i* in IGNI- (= Sanskrit *agni-* < **egni-*), if we assume that written G meant the sound *g* here. But if we admit the pronunciation *iηnis*, it is clear that the *i* corresponds to *i* in *tingo* = Greek τέγγω. The Latin spelling GN = *ηn* had at least a historic basis, like our *ng* = *η* < *ηg*, and that is more than can be said for the Greek spelling of the velar nasal.

Likewise the alteration of the occlusives indicates that GN meant *ηn*. Before a nasal, an occlusive becomes nasalized: *dm* > *mm*, *dn* > *nn*, *tn* > *nn*[4], *gm* > *mm*, *pm* > *mm*, *bn* > *mn*, *pn* > *mn*[5]. In view of such

[1] Compare Catalan *dugas* < *duas*. [2] *Ltn.*, 40.
[3] *Ltn.*, 41. [4] *Ltn.*, 144. [5] *Ltn.*, 145.

developments and parallel *dl* > *ll*[1], it is unreasonable to suppose that written G in GN < *kn*[1] was sounded as oral *g*. In Germany there is a traditional pronunciation of Latin *gn* as *ŋn*[2]; this may be a continuation of the ancient Latin sound. Likewise Spaniards sometimes sound *gn* as *ŋn* in book-words, instead of the *γn* or *gn* that the spelling appears to require.

These facts about *gn* seem to have been overlooked by Millardet when he constructed his theory of Sp. *ñ* < *yn* < *gn*[3]. Could *yn* have come from *ŋn*? Evidently not. The development of *ŋn* was nearly parallel with that of *kt*. In modern French the group *kt* has an explosive *k*, which may be indicated by writing *kᶜt*. In English, *k* is not explosive before *t*, so that our *kt* sounds like *tt* to French ears[4]; this *k* is so slightly audible that *picture* is vulgarly confused with *pitcher*, and even in educated speech *st* may replace the *skt* of *asked*. The regular formation of It. *tt* from *kt* implies a non-explosive *k*; being almost inaudible as a separate element, the *k* was naturally assimilated to *t*. We might perhaps suppose that, beside *tt* < *kt*, a symmetric speech-development would require *nn* < *ŋn*; but the parallel is not perfect. In *kt*, pronounced in the English way, the *k*-position is accompanied by no sound at all; what is heard, and identified with the impression of ordinary *k*, is due merely to the movement of closure, the glide from the preceding sound-position to the *k*-position. But in *ŋn* each element is audible throughout its whole duration. Hence when *ŋn* was assimilated, each element changed towards the other, producing the present Italian pronunciation *ññ*: *legno* = *leñño*. This formation of a new non-Latin sound, intermediate to *n* and *ŋ*, was perhaps helped by the slightly earlier development of the same sound from *ny*[5].

Outside of Italy the *k* of *kt* was probably explosive, and for this reason the derivative of *k* did not generally disappear, except after a consonant. It seems possible that the foreigners who learned Latin may have begun with *otto* for *okto* before this change became general in Italy; the Italians would naturally insist on the *k*-sound, thereby causing the foreigners to exaggerate and say *okᶜto*, instead of *okto* with non-explosive *k*. It is also possible that the Italians, who said *okto* ordinarily, changed this to emphatic *okᶜto* for the benefit of foreign

[1] *Ltn.*, 144.
[2] *Phn.*, 248.
[3] *Romania*, XLI, 253.
[4] *Frn.*, 121.
[5] I have explained the relative chronology of these consonants in an article that will be published in *Modern Philology*.

learners, and the latter imitated carefully what they heard[1]. Hence *kt* remained distinct from *tt* almost everywhere outside of Italy. Rumanian has *pt* < *kt*, and likewise *mn* < *ŋn*: *lemn*. In western Romanic, where double consonants[2] were regularly simplified, we find *ñ* < *ñn̄*, corresponding to It. *ñn̄*: Pt. *lenho* = Sp. *leño*, Pv. *denhe* = Fr. *daigne*.

The early Fr. *y* of *saint* < **saŋto* and the Sp. formation of *mbr* from *mn* might seem to favour the possibility of *yn* < *ŋn*; but they do not really do so. In Italian and Hispanic speech, **saŋto* developed no *y*. Sp. *mbr* < *mn* is an isolated development, and comparatively late, subsequent to the general Hispanic change of *mn* to *nn* (**donno* < *domnu*). The Sp. vowel of *leño* is strong evidence against such a formation as **liynu*. In Sp. *tiña* < *tĭnia*, *tiñe* < **tiñẹet* < *tĭngit*, the vowel *i* is plainly due to the influence of *ñ*: for this sound has a tongue-position related to that of close *i* nearly as that of close *i* is to that of open *i*. Evidently **liynu* would have developed stressed *i* in Spanish, by contraction of *iy*; or if we adopt Millardet's theory of a rapid change to *ñ*, the latter sound would have furnished an even stronger ground for the formation of close *i*, in accordance with *tiña* and *tiñe*.

The theory of *ñ* < *yn* < *gn* was invented to explain the apparent difference between Sp. *tamaño* = Pt. *tamanho* < *tam magnu* and Sp. *fecho* = Pt. *feito* < *factu*, Sp. *era* = Pt. *eira* < **ayra*. Its purpose was praiseworthy but misguided. As there was no *gn* to begin with, the whole theory falls. If there had been a real *gn*, and if it had become *yn*, the principle of syllabication would be discredited by the behaviour of *y*. Near the beginning of his essay Millardet states, as a general principle, that *ay* remains or changes according to syllable-division: Sp. *ma-yor* < *maiore* but *me-rino* < **may-rino* < *maiorinu*. This principle is all-important; we cannot help being grateful to Millardet for pointing out a fact which other writers have commonly ignored even if they were not ignorant of it. But this fundamental principle does not harmonize well with *a* in a derivative of the supposed **mayno*. Hence it becomes necessary for Millardet to assume a quick change of *yn* to *ñ* before the syllables had time to notice what was happening. Really the principle of syllabication is valid, and must be defended against its author. If **mayno* does not obey the law, so much the worse for

[1] I have heard an English-speaking person (American) pronounce emphatic *You do?* nearly like *You too?*, with a strongly aspirated *t*. The *d* was held so long that it became voiceless, and was aspirated as if it had been an ordinary *t*.

[2] Except *rr*, which is still different from intervocalic *r* in Hispanic. The reduction of *ll* and *nn* was late in Hispanic, and was accompanied by palatalization in Spain.

**mayno*. Let us banish **mayno* and look at the facts. In the first place, Latin had no sound-group *gn* in *magnu*; the written *g* was sounded *ŋ*, as shown above. Secondly, the probabilities are against a change of *ŋn* to *yn*. And lastly, *yn* would give a wrong Hispanic result anyway (Sp. **meño* or **meno*). The *yn*-theory is its own disproof. In Italy and the west, early *mn* was assimilated. So was *ŋn*, and it produced intermediate *ñn̄* and *n̄*.

*Oclu.

Menéndez Pidal supposes that intervocalic *kl* and *gl* formed early Sp. *j* (= *ž*) by passing through *yl*[1]. Apparently he does not assume λ between *yl* and *ž*: 'la oclusión de la *c* se afloja en una fricación, *y*, que en aragonés palataliza la *l*[2], en leonés la absorbe[2] y en castellano ant. se fortalece en *j* absorbiendo la *l*.' This treatment of Leonese seems insufficient; the various agreements of Leonese with Portuguese imply *y* < λ, the sound λ being kept unchanged in Pt. *ôlho*. A difficulty with regard to Castilian is the seeming discord between assumed **kwaylo* > *cuajo* and **ayra* > *era*. Millardet, who adopts the *yl*-theory, notices this difficulty and tries to explain *a* in *cuajo* by supposing that *yl* produced λ before *ay* elsewhere changed to *ey*[3]. Such an assumption might perhaps be justified, so far as the λ is concerned, if we could prove that *kl* and *gl* were the only sources of early Sp. *yl*. Can we prove this?

In Sp. *meytad* < **mey(e)tate*, the *t* indicates a very early loss of the pretonic vowel. We may assume a parallel development in *uigilare* > **veylar(e)*, which makes—not what the *yl*-theory requires, but—Sp. *velar*! This does not agree over-well with theoretic **kwaylo* > *cuajo*, **oylo* > *ojo*, **teyla* > *teja*. It might be objected that **meyetate* and **veyelare* could have lost their pretonic vowels at different dates. True; but the difference would favour an earlier **veylar(e)*, for *y* and *l* are both voiced, and might therefore have formed a group more readily than *y* and *t*. Again, it might be supposed that *velar* is based on *vela* < **veela* < **veyela* with loss of *y* before posttonic *e* disappeared. But this seems highly improbable, on account of the *y* in early Sp. *seyello* < *sigillu*, *veyo* < *uideo*. Evidently we must assume *uigilat* > **veyela* > **veyla* > *vela*, parallel with *digitu* > **deyedo* > **deydo* > *dedo*, the posttonic vowel being lost later than the pretonic one of **mey(e)tate*.

[1] *Esp.*, 100.
[2] The author gives the derivatives of *muliere*, to exemplify these dialectal developments of *kl*!
[3] *Romania*, XLI, 254.

In Pt. *metade* < **meytade* < **meytate* < **meyetate*, we find a contraction of stressless *ey* to *e*, in accord with Pt. *velar* < **veylar(e)* < *uigilare*. Intervocalic Pt. *l* was lost in the 12th century[1]: *véu* < *veo* < *uelu*, *má* < *maa* < *mala*. This loss of *l* seems to prove that the *y* of Pt. **veylar(e)* had the effect of a consonant and protected *l* until the 12th century, just as *y* protected *t* at a much earlier period in *metade* < **meytate*. We cannot well call Pt. *velar* a book-word, for an early book-word would lose *l*, not *g*—and this is precisely what happened in Pt. *vigiar*. Thus we may assume a common early Sp.-Pt. **veylar(e)*, in which *yl* did not form λ, notwithstanding the λ of Pt. *cualho* < *coagulu*, *ôlho* < *oculu*, *telha* < *tegula*. Apparently the *yl*-theory will not do for the Hispanic development of *kl* and *gl*.

The stressed vowels of Sp. *cuajo* and Pt. *cualho* involve the same difficulty as those of *tamaño* and *tamanho*. I have shown above that the *yn*-theory is untenable, as well as needless. Of course the *yl*-theory is not directly dependent on the *yn*-theory; but with the possibility of **mayno* gone, the persistent vowel of *cuajo* and similar words stands by itself in Spanish. In order to account for *cuajo* < **kwaylo*, we must shelve Millardet's excellent syllable-proposition. Evidently we cannot well disprove the idea that this principle began to operate in Hispanic at a certain convenient date: but neither can we prove it. It seems much more reasonable to consider it a permanent principle, since it agrees with Latin *ai* > *ae* > *e* and wide-spread Romanic *au* > *o*. In speaking of Sp. *o* < *au*, as in *oca* and *oro*, Millardet says[2] that the syllabic division of *ma-yo* has no parallel with regard to *au*. This is a mistake. The difference between *oca* < *au(i)ca*, *oro* < *auru*, and *ave* < *aue*, *llave* < *claue*, is a perfect parallel with *merino* < *mai(o)rinu*, *era* < **ayra*, beside *mayor* < *maiore*, *mayo* < *maiu*. The common habit of writing *v* for the sound *w* in *auis*, *clauis*, but not in *aurum*, *claudo*, is based on the medieval pronunciation of Latin. The well-known Hispanic treatment of *cautu* (> Pt. *couto* = Sp. *coto*) and *paucu* (> Pt. *pouco* = Sp. *poco*) shows that *au* ended with the consonant-sound *w*. Apparently the traditional spellings *avis* and *aurum* caused Millardet to overlook the identity of sound in such cases. It is curious to notice that the Macedonian dialect of Rumanian has *av* < *au* before a consonant, corroborating the Hispanic evidence with regard to *au*: *lavdu* = literary Rm. *laud* < *laudo*[3].

The Hispanic derivative of *oculu* seems to have become **oglo* at the time when *k* changed to *g* in *lágrima*. We might perhaps expect

[1] *Gr.*, 970. [2] *Romania*, XLI, 257. [3] *Rmn.*, 6.

the *g* of **oglo* to become *γ*, but probably this did not occur. The formation of λ from *l*, after *k* and *g*, is a wide-spread Romanic development, and may be assumed for Hispanic medial *gl*; compare *tš* < *κy* < *kλ* < *kl* in Sp. *macho* (= Pt. *macho*) < *masculu*. Apparently *gλ* underwent further assimilation through *ϱλ* to *λλ* and λ, in accordance with *ll* < *bl* in Sp. *trillar* < *tribulare*. These changes differ from the development of *espalda* < *spatula*, because Romanic words and syllables could begin with *kl* (*kλ*), *gl* (*gλ*), *pl*, *bl*, but not with *tl* and *dl*. On account of *tš* < *kλ* after a consonant, we might reasonably assume Sp. **ogλo* > *oϱyo* > **odžo*; but Pt. λ in *ôlho* makes this rather improbable. So long as there is no good evidence of disagreement between the two languages, it is more natural to suppose that they developed alike. But after reaching λ, the common intervocalic development ended. Sp. λ became *ϱ*, which is represented by *d* in *codrá*[1] = *cogerá* < *colligere habet*, *medrar* = *mejorar* < *meliorare*; compare *t* in *petral* < *pectorale* beside *tš* in *pechos* < *pectus*, *s* in *fresno* < *fraxinu* beside *š* in *exe* < *axe*. Portuguese also has formed *d* < λ before a consonant in *medrar* = *melhorar* < *meliorare*.

The Sp. development of intervocalic *ϱ* < λ was due to the need of avoiding confusion with the new λ formed from Latin *ll*. Before a vowel *ϱ* became *dž* (= English *j* or *dg* in *judge*). This value of early Sp. *j* is proved by the modern use of *dž* in Jewish speech[2], by the threefold evidence with regard to Arabic ج[3] and by *tš* < *dž* < *ϱ* < λ in western Asturian[4]. The later change of *dž* to *ž* has so many Romanic parallels that it needs no discussion. It may seem strange that *dž* should have lost *d* while *tš* kept *t*; but this difference of treatment has parallels in Slavonic. Thus in Old Bulgarian we find *ts* < *k* and *tš* < *k* before front vowels, corresponding to *z* < *dz* < *g* and *ž* < *dž* < *g*[5]. Of course it is possible that Sp. *dž* lost *d* before *tš* developed from *κ* and *κy*.

Octo.

Literary Italian has *tt* < *pt*, *tt* < *tt*, *tt* < *kt*, and the corresponding Venetian resultant is *t*, in accordance with the usual reduction of doubled consonants. This levelling is not generally found outside of Italy: *factu* > Rm. *fapt*, Fr. *fait*, Pv. *fach*, Sp. *fecho*, Pt. *feito*. All these developments may be explained by supposing that *kt* became *χt*; similar developments are Irish *χt* < *kt*[6], Greek *χt* < *kt* and *ft* < *pt*[7].

[1] *Altsp.*, 93.
[2] *Modern Philology*, VIII, 591.
[3] *Revue hispanique*, II, 54, 62, 66.
[4] *Ast.*, 33.
[5] *Altb.*, 43.
[6] *Ir.*, 14.
[7] *Revue des patois gallo-romans*, II, 10.

In Albanian, Romanic *kt* became χt, whence *ft*[1] after a labial vowel; compare $f < \chi$ in English *rough*, the reverse change in German[2], and the frequent interchanges, both $f < \chi$[3] and $\chi < f$[4], that occur in Rumanian. The close connection between Rumanian and Albanian allows us to assume Rm. $pt < ft < \chi t < kt$. This change from occlusive to fricative, and then back to occlusive, may seem odd, but such developments are not uncommon in the history of language. Stressless $u < o < u$ is normal in Portuguese and Rumanian[5]. Latin has $o < we$ (= Sanskrit *wa*)[6] in *somnus*[7] and *socer*[7]; and this *o* has produced *we* in Sp. *sueño, suegro*. Danish has $\ddot{o} < \bar{a} < \ddot{o}$ in *otte* = Icelandic *átta* = Latin *octo*. German has $t < d < \delta < \theta < t$[8] in *mutter* = Latin *mater*. English *mother* < *módor* has $\delta < d < \delta < \theta < t$; in vulgar American-English δ is often changed to *d*.

In French we find *fait* < *factu* beside *façon* < *factione*. We might perhaps account for this difference by supposing that *kty* lost its *k* before intervocalic *kt* became χt[9]. But such a development is highly improbable. We can readily understand why Spanish shows no trace of *k* in *santo* < *sanctu*, *yerto* < **erctu*, *siesta* < *sexta*: *k* is almost inaudible in the groups *ŋkt* and *rkt*, and *ks* before a consonant was abnormal in Latin, being artificially preserved or restored in *sextus* and *textus* under the influence of *sex* and *texere*[10]. But an explanation of this kind would be hardly reasonable for *kty* and intervocalic *kt*, as the *k* is equally audible in each case, and equally abnormal in the living forms of Romanic speech.

If we assume *factu* > **faχto* and *factione* > **faχtšone*, it is clear that in the latter word χ (or its derivative ξ) could easily be eliminated by dissimilation, in accordance with the development[11] of *ts* for *sts* in early Fr. *oz* < *hostis*. We may suppose that to produce Fr. *fait* and Catalan *fet*, χt became ξt by partial assimilation and afterwards ξ changed to the corresponding voiced sound *y*. This last step can be called assimilative also, since the ξ was always preceded by a voiced sound. In Provençal there was a stronger tendency to assimilation: apparently ξt developed through $\xi\kappa$ to $\xi\kappa\xi$ or $\check{s}t\check{s}$[12], and then the first fricative was eliminated as in *tritz* for *tristz*. The *ch* of Pv. *sancha*, a variant of *santa*, implies **saññca* < **saŋta*, with direct assimilation[13] of the

[1] *Alb.*, 42. [2] *Mhd.*, 48. [3] *Rmn.*, 53.
[4] *Rmn.*, 68. [5] *Romanic Review*, I, 431. [6] *Ltn.*, 42.
[7] Cp. early English *swefn* and *swehor*. [8] *Urg.*, 124.
[9] *Altfr.*, 96. [10] *Ltn.*, 137.
[11] Previous to the general loss of *s* before a consonant.
[12] With $t\check{s} < \kappa\xi < \kappa$ as in Rm. *cinci*, It. *cinque* and Fr. *charge*.
[13] Here too stronger than in French.

velar-dental group to an intermediate prepalatal one. It is of course possible that *facta* likewise produced Pv. *facha* through **faκa*, with direct assimilation of *kt*; but this is rather unlikely, on account of the disagreement with the other Romanic forms. In French *saint*, *y* was due to the *η* of **saηto* < *saηktu*; in Italian and the Hispanic tongues **saηto* became *santo* by assimilation, parallel with *contare* and *contar* from *computare*.

According to Millardet[1], 'la plupart des hispanistes' hold that *kt* developed into *yt*, from which Sp. *ch* was formed. This theory might perhaps be made to harmonize with some Romanic dialects, but it will not do as a general principle in Spanish. In the first place, even if it were true for *ocho* and *pechos*, it would not be the whole truth. Leaving aside words like *santo* and *yerto*, where *k* was dropped between consonants, we find Sp. *collaço* = Pt. *colaço* < *collacteu*: here *k* evidently did not make *y*, whatever may have happened in Sp. *fecho* = Pt. *feito* < *factu*.

Secondly, it is not clear how Sp. *ocho* could develop from **oyto*. Two eminent supporters of the *yt*-theory, Zauner[2] and Menéndez Pidal[3], tell us that Sp. *we* was derived from *oy* in such cases as *agüero* = Pt. *agoiro*, *Duero* = Pt. *Doiro*. This development, presumably to be explained as *we* < *oé* < *óe* < *oy*, in accord with Sp. *fué* = Pt. *foi* < *foe* < *fuit*, would seem to require Sp. **ueto* or **uecho* from **oyto*. It cannot be assumed that the originally open *o* of *octo*, beside close *o* < *u* in *auguriu* (and *fuit*), might have made a difference; for the Pt. *o* is close in such words[4], and Sp. *ocho*, with *o* < *ŏ* contrary to *huésped* < *hospite*, shows that this language too developed close *o* before a palatal. Neither can we reasonably suppose that **oyto* made *ocho* before the *oy* of Sp. **agoyro* underwent change, for Sp. *vergüeña* and *cigüeña* have *we* < *oy*. If the *y* of Sp. **oyto* had been expansive enough to palatalize *t* and be absorbed therein, the *y* of **vergoyña* would have been absorbed even more readily by *ñ*, since *ñ* and *y* have nearly the same tongue-positions. Therefore *octo* did not develop *y* in Spanish.

Finally, it is plain that 'la plupart des hispanistes' overlooked Sp. *mitad* < *meytad* < **mey(e)tate*, in constructing or adopting the *yt*-theory. In this word the *y* was in contact with *t* early enough to hinder the formation of *d*: contemporary forms were *medietates* and *uetata*, **meytates* and **vetata*, *meytades* and *vedada*. We cannot assume **oyto* and **peytos* as having *yt* later than the formation of *yt* in

[1] *Romania*, XLI, 249.
[2] *Altsp.*, 23.
[3] *Esp.*, 44.
[4] *Prt.*, 79.

**meytates*, for the *yt* of *meytad* existed until after the Sp. development of *ch*; **oyto* and **peytos* contemporary with early *meytades* (or **meytates*) would require later **mechad* parallel with *ocho* and *pechos*. And we cannot assume *ch* < *yt* before **meyetate* lost the second vowel, for *uīctu* makes *vito*. Supposing **meyetates* to have been contemporary with **peytos* and **viyto*, the next step **meytates* would require an altered form of **peytos*, such as **pe(y)κos* or *petšos*. At the same time **viyto* must have lost *y*, as *vito* is not parallel with the derivative of **peytos*. Thus we should have *vito* contemporary with **meytates*, for in the latter word *y* and *t* must have been in contact a considerable time before *meytades* was developed: and **meytates* > *meytades* would have required *vito* > **vido*. That is, **meytates* excludes both earlier **peytos*, which would require **viyto* > **vido*, and contemporary or later **peytos*, which would require **mechad*. Notwithstanding Pt. *peito* and *oito*, we must give up Sp. **oyto* and **peytos*; the common development stops short of this point. The *yt*-theory may be sound with regard to *vito*, but it cannot be true for *pechos* and *ocho*.

In the Hispanic derivatives of *collacteu*, *ty* became *tsy* or *tš*[1] very early, and the fricative (presumably χ) representing *k* was eliminated so soon that it did not affect the vowel *a*. The elimination of the fricative was analogous to Sp. *s—p* for *s—sp* in *escupo* < *exconspuo*, *ts* for *sts* in *mecer* < *miscere*, *tš* for *stš* in *macho* (= Pt. *macho*[2]) < *masculu*, Catalan *aquets*[3] for *aquests* < **accu*[4] *istos*, and the Fr. and Pv. developments mentioned above.

In the Hispanic derivatives of *factu*, *kt* became *χt*, whence *ξt* by partial assimilation. From this point Spanish and Portuguese entered upon different paths. In the west *ξt* became *yt*, in accordance with the Catalan and French developments. In Castilian, *ξt* produced *ξκ* by further assimilation, and afterwards the *κ* became *κξ* and *tš*; compare It. *tš* < *κ* in *cinque*, Sp. *tš* < (λ)*κ* < *lt* in *mucho*. The sound-group *ξκξ* (or later *štš*) lost its first element in the same way as the derivatives of *kty* and *skl*.

The sound *ξ* has nearly the same tongue-position as *y*, and therefore affected the preceding vowel. A change similar to that of Hispanic **faχto* > **feξto* is found in early English *niht* = German *nacht*, with *i* (for *e* < *œ*) due to *ξ* < *χ*[5]. Likewise the open vowels of **oξto* and **peξtos* became close, in accord with Sp. *moyo* < *mŏdiu*, *meyo* < *mĕdiu*;

[1] For Hispanic *ç* = *ts* < *tš*, see *Modern Philology*, VIII, 597.
[2] Northern Pt. *ch* is still sounded *tš*.
[3] *Ctl.*, 110.
[4] That is, *eccu* modified by *hac*.
[5] *Eng.*, 174.

but close *e* remained in **estreξto* < *strictu*, as in *dedo* < ** deyeto* < *digitu*. In *vito* < *uīctu* the *ξ* (or its derivative *y*) was absorbed by the very similar sound *i* before it had time to palatalize the Sp. *t*. Here, as in the earlier treatment of *kty*, Spanish and Portuguese agreed with regard to the consonants. They agreed in the treatment of all vowels followed by *kt*, and we may therefore assume that the Pt. vowel-changes were due to *ξ*, not to the later *y* which would have had the same effect.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

VICTOR HUGO'S USE OF CHAMBERLAYNE'S 'L'ÉTAT PRÉSENT DE L'ANGLETERRE' IN 'L'HOMME QUI RIT.'

We have seen what use Victor Hugo made of Beeverell's *Délices de la Grande Bretagne* in creating the setting of *L'Homme qui rit*[1]; another of his 'livres de chevet' was a French translation of Chamberlayne's *Present State of England*, published in Amsterdam in 1688 under the title of *L'État Présent de l'Angleterre*. Certain facts made use of by Victor Hugo, we find both in the *Délices* and in the *État Présent de l'Angleterre*, but for the most part, the matter of these two books differs essentially. The *Délices* aims at giving a picture of England, to a large extent physical and geographical; the *État Présent* barely touches on the outward appearance of England, but deals with it rather from the historical, civil, social and legal side. Hence we find that whereas Victor Hugo borrowed from the *Délices* colour for his pictures of physical, traditional, legendary England, he borrows from Chamberlayne certain facts relating to certain people who played a part in the civil or social life of their day, some information with regard to the army, many details which helped him to his conception of the English nobility and of court life under Charles II, James II and Queen Anne; on Chamberlayne, too, he seems to depend largely for his knowledge of English law.

None but Victor Hugo could have seen the possibilities of Chamberlayne's book as a source of information; none other could have had such a power of using disjointed facts, arid in nature, of weaving them into the whole plan of his work. See what use he makes of individual people mentioned by Chamberlayne. Ursus, we are told, had written comedies, as he had sold drugs. 'Il avait, entre autres œuvres, composé une bergerade héroïque en l'honneur du chevalier Hugh Middleton qui, en 1608, apporta à Londres une rivière. Cette rivière était tranquille dans le comté de Hartford, à soixante milles de Londres; le chevalier Middleton...se mit à remuer la terre, la creusant ici, l'élevant là, parfois

[1] *Modern Language Review*, vol. VIII, pp. 173 ff.

vingt pieds haut, parfois trente pieds profond, fit des aqueducs de bois en l'air, et ça et là huit cents ponts, de pierre, de brique, de madriers, et un beau matin, la rivière entra dans Londres.' This is the matter on which the poetic imagination of Ursus works, and creates 'une belle bucolique entre le fleuve Tamis et la rivière Serpentine.' Chamberlayne is not responsible alone for Victor Hugo's choosing to make Sir Hugh Middleton's exploit the subject of Ursus' pastoral; Sir Hugh's enterprise made a great impression on seventeenth century writers. Chamberlayne says (we quote from the French edition of 1688, used by Hugo): '...une nouvelle Rivière que le Chevalier Hugh Middleton, qui meriteroit pour cela une Statue de Bronze, fit venir à ses propres depens, et par une addresse ingenieuse, d'Amwell et de Chadwell, qui sont deux sources d'eau près de Ware dans la Province de Hartford d'où elle fait en serpentant un cours de 60 milles auparavant que de venir à Londres' (II, p. 159). In the *Nouvelles Observations sur l'Angleterre* by l'abbé Coyer published in 1769—a book which Victor Hugo knew and quotes in *L'Homme qui rit*—we find another detail not given by Chamberlayne: 'Un patriote, Sir Hugh Middleton, y amena par son art, et à ses frais d'une distance de vingt lieues, une rivière qui, à son arrivée, se partage en huit-cents aqueducs.' Mention is made of Sir Hugh also in the fourth volume of Beeverell's *Délices*. It seems to be the phrase 'à ses frais' that suggested to Hugo the curious comparison of the stream to the young love of an old man, who must be bought with a price.

Again in Chamberlayne's book (I, p. 179), among a number of court officials, mention is made of 'Guillaume Sampson Coq, un ancien Officier qui chanté toute la nuit comme un Coq, et declare par son Chant quelle heure il est.' His wages are given as '9. l. st. 2. chel. 6. sols.' In the English edition of 1687, William Sampson is printed in italics, and followed by a comma, while 'Cock' is added in ordinary print, to describe his office. Hugo uses this piece of information to give an air of truth to his theories with regard to the comprachicos. He tells us how, in the time of Charles II. a man was operated on in such a way as made it possible for him to crow like a cock. Thus does he insinuate that mutilation for one reason or another was a thing of ordinary occurrence at that time. However, the operation disgusted the Duchess of Portsmouth, and a non-mutilated man was appointed to the post. And so Hugo makes up his patchwork of fact and fiction; he introduces in natural fashion his quotation from Chamberlayne, and adds in a footnote, 'Voir le docteur Chamberlayne, "État Présent de l'Angleterre 1688, 1re partie, chap. xiii, p. 179."' 'On choisissait,'

he writes, 'd'ordinaire pour cet emploi honorable un ancien officier. Sous Jacques II, ce fonctionnaire se nommait William Sampson Coq, et recevait annuellement pour son chant neuf livres deux schellings six sous.' It is characteristic of Hugo to write 'William' instead of Guillaume; he delights in using the few English words which he treasured in his vocabulary.

L'Homme qui rit furnishes us with yet another example of the use Hugo makes of a historical personage in connection with a fictitious character, so as to give a semblance of historical reality to that character. In the last paragraph of the chapter in which Hugo describes Josiane, he says, 'Elle possédait de grands biens, dont plusieurs venaient des dons de Madame sans queue au duc d'York. *Madame sans queue*, cela veut dire Madame tout court. On appelait ainsi Henriette d'Angleterre, duchesse d'Orléans, la première femme de France après la reine.' The whole of this paragraph seems to have been an afterthought, as it was added to the original manuscript. Chamberlayne in speaking of Henriette de France says, 'Cette princesse, on l'appelloit Madame sans Queuë comme êtant la premiére Dame de France.' The name 'Madame sans queue' pleased Hugo, who straightway profited by it, in giving an 'état civil' to Josiane.

In the brouillon of *L'Homme qui rit*, there are many historical notes on Queen Anne, all jumbled together, and in many cases illegible; for Victor Hugo made note of what might be of service to him, on whatever lay nearest to his hand—it might be an old visiting card, the back of an envelope, or the unused space of a telegram! From the brouillon we learn that 'Anne était lente et taciturne.' 'Elle était bornée et obstinée.' Hugo works out a comparison between Anne and Elizabeth which was suggested to him by Beeverell's *Délices* (vol. v, pp. 931, 959—961); he borrows but one detail from Chamberlayne, but it, in itself, is most interesting and instructive. Hugo wishes to show us Anne, jealous of Josiane, jealous for many reasons, and not least because Anne was a simple lady, daughter of Anne Hyde. To accentuate this lack of royalty in Anne, and to prepare us for it, Hugo says early in his chapter on Anne's life: 'Elle était humiliée de n'avoir pour parrain que Gilbert, archevêque de Cantorbéry...Un simple primat est un parrain médiocre.' Chamberlayne says in his summary of Anne's life: 'Son parrain étoit Monseigneur Gilbert, Archevêque de Cantorbery' (I, p. 142). The humiliation in having such a godfather, instead of the pope of Rome, exists only in the mind of Hugo.

'Le vrai titre de ce livre serait l'aristocratie,' says Victor Hugo

in the preface of *L'Homme qui rit.* The court is the stage on which the nobility plays its part; consequently Victor Hugo lets slip no opportunity of describing, not so much court life, as court functions, court dress, court etiquette, court officials, noblemen who are to be met at court; in such description, in putting before us odd ceremonies, what might almost be called the technicalities of court life, Victor Hugo has constant recourse to Chamberlayne.

At the beginning of the first book, Hugo describes Ursus' caravan. Inside there are two inscriptions: 'Seules choses qu'il importe de savoir,' and 'Satisfactions qui doivent suffire à ceux qui n'ont rien.' The 'satisfactions,' as we have seen, have been suggested almost entirely by the descriptions of the mansions of the English nobility to be found in Beeverell's *Délices.* The 'Seules choses qu'il importe de savoir' are of a different nature. They concern not the property of the nobility, but their rights, their rights to bear certain titles, to wear certain jewels, their privileges, their immunity from punishment. These 'seules choses' have been copied almost word for word from Chamberlayne, I, pp. 219, 289—315. Here and there, there is some slight alteration, as, for instance, Hugo writes, 'La baronie entière se compose de treize fiefs nobles et un quart.' Chamberlayne says 'et un tiers.' But the variations from the text of Chamberlayne are few and unimportant. One paragraph which was added to the original manuscript, 'Quand il plaît à un lord, il lève un régiment et le donne au roi; ainsi font leurs grâces le duc d'Athol, le duc de Hamilton, et le duc de Northumberland,' is to be found in l'abbé Coyer's *Nouvelles Observations sur l'Angleterre,* 1779, p. 46.

Hugo had an intimate knowledge of Chamberlayne's book. Yet when he speaks of court officials, he does not seem to be clear as to what their functions are. This may be due to his habit of reading things superficially, and of giving free play to his imagination with regard to what he read, before he had thoroughly mastered its meaning; it may on the other hand mean that Hugo reserved for himself the right to treat facts in an arbitrary manner. Thus he tells us that Lord David was a 'gentilhomme du lit. Un gentilhomme du lit couche toutes les nuits près du roi sur un lit qu'on dresse. On est douze gentilshommes et on se relaie' (Chamberlayne says they were nine, not twelve). 'Lord David, *dans ce poste,* fut le chef de l'avenier du roi, celui qui donne l'avoine aux chevaux et qui a deux cent soixante livres de gages.' Chamberlayne tells us on the contrary that the post of 'chef de l'avenier du roi' was held under the Grand Ecuyer, and had consequently no

connection with that of the gentleman of the bedchamber. In the passage that follows, Hugo changes the figures at will: 'Cinq cochers,' he says, 'les cinq postillons du roi, les cinq palefreniers du roi.' Chamberlayne allows twenty-one 'palefreniers,' but only four coachmen and no postillions! (Chamberlayne, I, p. 192).

David at one moment had almost been appointed 'groom of the stole,' but the king finally decided not to appoint him to this lofty position because 'il faut pour cela être prince ou pair' (Chamberlayne, I, p. 180). We wonder whether Victor Hugo remembered when he thus disqualified David, that the 'groom of the stole' is simply the first of the gentlemen of the bedchamber? Or was there in reality an impassable gulf between the first gentleman of the bedchamber, and his fellows?

Ursus in one of his long harangues on the aristocracy says to Gwynplaine, 'Sais-tu que le lord haut chambellan, qui est un office héréditaire dans la famille des ducs d'Ancaster, habille le roi le jour du couronnement?' This is hard to reconcile with Chamberlayne, p. 170, where we read: 'Les Comtes d'Oxford ont long-temps possedé cette dignité depuis le temps du Roy Henry I, par une espèce de succession hereditaire; mais aux derniers Couronnements, ces ceremonies ont esté faites par les Comtes de Lindsey, qui pretendent que cette dignité leur est deüe par droit de succession hereditaire, comme estant descendus d'une fille et heritiere universelle.'

In Beeverell's *Délices*, too, we find the name of Robert Bertie, Marquis of Lindsey, Lord Great Chamberlain of England.

The description of the ceremony which took place when Gwynplaine is restored to his rightful place as Lord Fermain Clancharlie, is exceedingly curious. The costumes and the speeches of the attendants alike astonish us. We wonder how much of these is the creation of Hugo's imagination. The problem solves itself as we read the following in Chamberlayne (II, pp. 235—240): 'Du College des Herauts.' 'Dans cette Societé, il y a premiérement trois que l'on appelle, Reges Armorum Anglorum, Roi d'Armes; six Herauts d'Armes, & quatre poursuivants d'Armes.

'Entre les Rois d'Armes, le premier et principal a le Nom de Garter, institué par le Roi Henri V. Son Office est de servir les Chevaliers de la Jarretiére dans leurs Cérémonies, de regler les solemnitez des Funerailles des Grands Seigneurs, de porter la nouvelle & d'avertir ceux qui sont nouvellement élevez à cet honneur, de leur faire sçavoir le temps qu'ils seront installez à Windsor; d'avoir soin de faire mettre leurs armes sur leurs sieges....

'Le second Roi d'Armes porte le nom de Clarencieux, ainsi appellé du Duc de Clarence, à qui il appartenoit prémierement....Son Office est d'ordonner et de disposer les Pompes funebres de la petite Noblesse, comme des Baronets, Chevaliers, Ecuyers, et Gentils-hommes du côté du Midy de la Rivière de Trente, d'où vient qu'on l'appelle quelquefois Surroy ou Southroy.

'Le 3. Roi d'Armes s'appelle Norroy ou Northroy dont l'Office est le même que le precedent dans le Nord de la Rivière de Trente....

'Les six Herauts, qui appartenoient autrefois à des Ducs, ont été quelquefois appellez, Ducs d'Armes, aujourd'huy on les appelle et on les range ainsi. 1. Windsor, 2. Richemond, 3. Chester, 4. Somerset, 5. York, 6. Lancastre....

'Anciennement il y avoit plusieurs de ces Herauts en Angleterre, et de ceux aussi qu'on appelle poursuivants d'Armes, mais ils sont reduits aujourd'huy à quatre seulement, qui se nomment, 1. Croix Rouge, 2. Rouge Dragon, 3. Portcullis, 4. Manteau Bleu, à cause des marques qu'ils portoient sur eux....

'Pour la Création et pour le Couronnement du Roi d'Armes Garter, il y a premièrement une Epée et un Liv., sur lequel on préte le serment solemnel; ensuitte une Couronne Dorée, un Collier d' SS., un Gobelet de Vin, lequel aprés la Cérémonie appartient au Roi d'Armes nouvellement créé, une Cotte d'Armes de Velours d'une riche broderie....

'Un Heraut d'Armes est aussi créé avec la même Cérémonie, hormis la Couronne et avec cette difference qu'il faut que sa Cotte d'Armes soit de Satin en broderie d'or....Ils font un Serment solemnel d'être fideles au Roi, Officieux à la Noblesse; de garder le Secret des Chevaliers, Ecuyers, Dames, & Demoiselles; d'assister les pauvres Gentils-hommes, & Demoiselles, les Veuves & les Vierges....'

The quotation is long, but serves to show how Hugo found his matter for the whole scene, which is by no means the creation of his imagination. The heralds, their names, picturesque in themselves, their costumes, differing only in details, their offices, and their oaths; all this does Chamberlayne supply, all this does Hugo accept, and of it makes the very groundwork of his scene. There is no invention on his part, but only clever adaptation and arrangement.

As Victor Hugo drew on Beeverell's *Délices* for descriptions of the homes of the English nobility, so does he depend on Chamberlayne for information concerning the nobles themselves, their number, their rights and privileges, their power and duties in the House of Lords.

English peers, he tells us, may not, except in special cases bear foreign titles. Chamberlayne says (I, p. 291), 'Les Loix d'Angleterre defendent à tous les Sujets du Royaume de recevoir aucun Titre héréditaire d'honneur ou de dignité, ou des Presents d'aucun Prince Etranger....' Henry Arundel, baron Arundel de Wardour, 'comte du Saint-Empire,' is one of the exceptions mentioned. Chamberlayne speaks of him as 'comte de l'Empire.' How characteristic of Hugo to add 'Saint'! What visions of past glories the word evokes!

But Hugo's great attempt to give us an idea of the inner meaning of the English aristocracy is to be found in the chapter entitled 'Gwynplaine est dans le juste, Ursus est dans le vrai.' Elsewhere he may describe curious ceremonies and the outward trappings of the nobility; but here, through his interpreter Ursus, with scarcely veiled irony, Victor Hugo makes clear his condemnation of what he considers to be the birthright of the aristocracy.

'Tous les titres des lords indiquent une souveraineté sur une terre, le comte Rivers excepté, qui a pour titre son nom de famille,' writes Hugo. The same exception is made by Chamberlayne (I, p. 211). From the following page of Chamberlayne, Hugo gleaned the fact that the oldest English viscount was Robert Brent, who was granted his title by Henry V; and on the following page again, we read that the Bishop of Man is subject to the 'comte de Derby.' Hugo makes this particular fact his basis for generalisation, 'Le clergé lui-même relève des lords. L'évêque de Man est le sujet du comte de Derby.'

Victor Hugo was keenly interested in figures and statistics of all kinds. In different places, and in quite different connections he discusses the numbers of the nobles, the numbers of lords under different kings, the proportion of knights and commons in the House of Commons. In this connection there are several interesting pages in the brouillon-manuscript of *L'Homme qui rit*. On page 167 there are various notes, roughly jotted down, and crossed out, for the most part, on the English peerage. On the following page, we have the heading 'Pairie' and this note, 'Nom des nobles éteints—6.' Then on the next page (170) there are many rough jottings, as, for instance, 'Jacques II,' 'noms selon la vieille orthographe française normande très usitée à la chambre des lords en ce temps là,' 'Chambre des Pairs (+ 2 archevêques et 24 évêques).' There follows a list of the nobles, three marquises, sixty-six counts and countesses, nine viscounts, and sixty-nine barons and baronesses. In the margin Victor Hugo adds up the different numbers, so we find this little sum:

15	and beside it: Ann	29
8		5
66		77
9		9
69		61
162		181
26 ev.		26
188 – 6		207

We understand that he subtracts the six nobles whose families had died out, from the total, under James.

These numbers and details have evidently been taken from Chamberlayne (I, p. 304). In Ursus' speech, we see the life Hugo gives to these dead facts, 'Et même entre eux, ils ont des nuances, ces hauts seigneurs. ...Que c'est beau pour un peuple d'avoir vingt-cinq ducs, cinq marquis, soixante-seize comtes, neuf vicomtes et soixante et un barons, qui font cent soixante-seize pairs, qui les uns sont grâce et les autres seigneurie.' We do not understand why Hugo has slightly altered the figures from those he noted down correctly in the brouillon, but it is easy to see why he introduces these figures when we hear Ursus' ironical comment, 'Après cela, quand il y aurait quelques haillons par-ci par-là! Tout ne peut pas être en or. Haillons, soit; est-ce que ne voilà pas de la pourpre? L'un achète l'autre.' In 'Le Capitole et son voisinage' Hugo gives the number of lords under James II as one hundred and eighty-eight (which corresponds to the total in the brouillon), and compares it with the number under Anne—207. The number under Anne he deduced from Beeverell's *Délices* (vol. v, p. 872). Chamberlayne (I, p. 312) supplied him with the number of lords under Elizabeth. From the small peerage under Elizabeth, and the growing numbers of lords under James II and Anne, Hugo deduces a general proposition. 'Délayer l'aristocratie est une politique....La seigneurie moins nombreuse est plus intense.'

A little earlier in the same chapter, in discussing the powers of the aristocracy, Victor Hugo gives us the numbers of commons and knights in the Lower House. We cannot see how Hugo has arranged his numbers—he quotes correctly the sixteen barons of the Cinq-Ports—elsewhere he says, 'Les barons des Cinq Ports étant huit,' whereas Chamberlayne says (II, p. 72), 'Les huit Cinque Ports envoyent seize Barons,' but when we add up the figures given by Chamberlayne we get the total of three hundred and ninety commons. We wonder sometimes

whether Victor Hugo was not at times satisfied with remembering approximately figures which he had accurately noted, and partially forgotten.

But if Victor Hugo can draw philosophical-political conclusions from mere numbers, how fruitful must the consideration of the privileges of the nobility be! It seems to matter little what a noble is or says or does; he is a noble, that alone is sufficient to safeguard him against the punishment or the judgment that might be meted out to an ordinary mortal. Thus 'William Cavendish, duc de Devonshire, qui était très imbécile, avait tous les grades d'Oxford et ne savait pas l'orthographe.' In Chamberlayne (I, p. 295) we read: 'Tout Pair du Royaume qui a voix et séance au Parlement, sera sur sa Requête, par un Statut d'Edouard VI, jugé pour la première fois comme un Clerc convaincu, quand même il ne sçauroit pas lire.' If a noble commits a crime, he may not be hanged like a commoner (Chamberlayne, I, p. 55). In Ursus' tirade on a lord, he sums him up as 'celui qui a tout et est tout' and then explains in detail what he means by 'tout.' Much of this has been suggested by Chamberlayne. Chamberlayne makes mention of Lucius, the most ancient king of England (I, p. 32); of the 'ad consilium impendendum' of royal letters convoking the commons, as compared with the more modern 'ad consentiendum' (II, p. 68); of the Doomsday-book, as the register of the property of subjects, prepared by William the Conqueror (II, pp. 83—84), and kept by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (II, p. 84). 'Les grands sont grands,' writes Hugo, 'Un pair parlant de lui-même dit nos. Un pair est au pluriel. Le roi qualifie les pairs consanguinei nostri.' This too has been taken from Chamberlayne (I, p. 288). So near indeed are the peers to royalty, that one of them, Henry Ratecliff, Count of Surrey, has the right to remain covered in the presence of the king (I, p. 299).

Thus does Victor Hugo, by wise choice of detail, draw a sharp contrast between those who are all and have all, and those who, to keep the proper balance, are nothing and have nothing.

But in this magnificent and privileged world there are differences; there are various degrees of splendour, various ranks of dignity. These differences must be clearly brought out when England's aristocracy meet to deliberate on affairs of state. It is difficult to speak with authority on Hugo's sources of information with regard to the Houses of Parliament. In the brouillon, for instance, there are several notes (pp. 173—5) which seem to have been copied direct from Grosley's *Londres* (vol. IV, p. 344); but unless we consider the similarity of

the pieces as proof, we have no proof that Hugo knew Grosley's *Londres* —he might, on the other hand, have known a book which had stolen large pieces from Grosley, as literary honesty seemed to be very rare in those days. Other notes in the brouillon we find to correspond to pieces in Latour's book on London.

To return to Chamberlayne, however, there are certain details given by Hugo, of which Chamberlayne makes no mention—mostly details which refer to the decoration of the halls. But having made these reservations, we can say that here, as elsewhere, Hugo owes much to Chamberlayne. We read, for instance (II, p. 52), 'Le roi prend place au haut bout de la Chambre sur une Chaise Royale qui est sous un Daiz,' and again, 'A la main droite du roi contre la muraille, il y a un Banc où s'assient les deux Archevêques.' Victor Hugo says that on the left of the throne, there were 'pliants pour les ducs royaux.' Chamberlayne has, 'A la main gauche du Roi, il y a un Siège pour le Duc d'York'; Hugo speaks of 'un crieur de la Verge noire' and Chamberlayne of 'un crieur qui se tient dehors.' But for those slight alterations, and the omissions mentioned above, the whole description of the nobility, arranged round the throne, is to be found in Chamberlayne.

In one detail, Chamberlayne says exactly the contrary to what Hugo states, 'Lorsque le Roi est en Parlement avec sa Couronne sur la Tête, les Seigneurs sont decouverts' (II, p. 54). Hugo says, 'Dans les cérémonies royales, les pairs temporels avaient la couronne en tête, et les pairs spirituels la mître.' Yet there can be no doubt but that Chamberlayne is Hugo's authority; he follows Chamberlayne's order of precedency in the case of the archbishops, and accepts his chronological order of peers (II, p. 53) and the distinction he makes between bishops and the archbishop of Canterbury. Chamberlayne says (I, p. 244): 'Le Roy dans les Lettres qu'il luy écrit luy donne la qualité de Dei gratiâ archiepiscopus Cantuariensis, et luy-même en écrivant, il met Divinâ Providentiâ, au lieu que les autres Evêques écrivent Divinâ Permissione.' Victor Hugo condenses and says: 'il est, lui, évêque par la divine providence, tandis que les autres ne le sont que par la divine permission.'

In the discussion in the House of Lords as to whether the provision for Anne's husband should be increased or not, the lords, Hugo tells us, rise and say, 'Content ou non-content,' Chamberlayne says, 'Chacun répondant à part "Content" ou "non"' (II, p. 65). This form of answer, however, is quoted in many books on seventeenth and eighteenth century England.

But Chamberlayne proved useful to Victor Hugo in yet another direction, in providing him with invaluable information on English punishments, laws, and law-court officials. Hugo used such information entirely at his own discretion, with little respect for legal or historical accuracy. Thus he wishes to draw a distinct line of difference between the Stuarts and William and Mary with regard to the comprachicos. His point is to show that Gwynplaine was mutilated with the king's knowledge if not with his consent; and that such things could no longer happen when the Stuarts were deposed. And so he must manufacture laws against the comprachicos, approved by William and Mary. Thus we have in the last paragraph of the book devoted to the comprachicos, a list of laws brought in against them. All those laws are given almost word for word by Chamberlayne. Thus we have (I, p. 57), 'Le Parjure ou faux Temoin avec Serment, est puni du Pillory appellé en Latin Collistrigium, et on le marque au front avec un fer chaud d'un P, ses Biens sont confisqués et les Arbres de ses bois déracinés,' and again (I, p. 56), 'le Criminel doit être marqué à la main gauche avec un fer chaud imprimant un I,' and yet again, 'On punit les Femmes quérelleuses en les faisant asseoir dans un trébuchet appellé par les Anglois Cucking Stool, peut-être du mot François Coquine et de l'Allemand Stul qui signifie Chaise de Putain. On les asseoit dans cette Chaise suspendüe sur quelque Riviére ou Etang profond, et on laisse tomber la Chaise dans l'eau, où l'on plonge la Femme par trois fois pour rafraîchir sa Colére.' But the curious point is, that those laws have no bearing whatsoever on the comprachicos, that Chamberlayne (whom Victor Hugo quotes in the last line to give an air of greater verity to the whole) quotes those laws in as early an edition of his work as that of 1671, and that they consequently could not have been measures taken in the time of William and Mary. Even if Hugo did not realise that an earlier edition of *L'État Présent de l'Angleterre* existed, he knew that the date of the *translation* which he possessed was 1688, and William and Mary began to reign in 1689. It is clear that Hugo here changed the facts, not accidentally, but by design, to suit his case. One other point strikes us in this connection. Hugo insists on the longevity of English law, 'Cette punition (that of the cucking-stool) existe encore dans la législation d'Angleterre,' and quotes Chamberlayne as if in support of his statement, yet surely it is not permissible to call the seventeenth century 'to-day'!

Ursus quotes the laws of this chapter of Chamberlayne (I, pp. 58, 59) when he admonishes Gwynplaine to be careful in speaking of the

aristocracy. The punishment meted out to the drunkard, to him who strikes a person in Westminster Hall, or in the palace of the king, to him who is convicted of heresy—all this Hugo has copied from Chamberlayne, 'On punit les Yvrognes, les Vagabonds etc., en leur mettant les pieds aux Ceps pour quelques heures' (I, p. 59); 'Celuy qui frappe quelqu'un à la Cour du Roy...a la main droite coupée publiquement.... Celuy qui frappe une personne dans la Salle de Westminster...est condanné à une prison perpétuelle et ses Biens confisqués....' (I, p. 57); 'Un Homme ou une Femme convaincus d'Hérésie...étoient livrés au bras Seculier et bruslés tous vifs.' Chamberlayne adds, of this last punishment, 'Ce supplice a été revoqué depuis.' It would, however, ill suit Hugo's purpose to make mention of increased leniency, so he omits Chamberlayne's last phrase.

Hugo has drawn on Chamberlayne (I, p. 55) for his description of the torture chamber. 'Au cas qu'un Criminel de petite Trahison, ou de Félonnie, refuse de répondre, ou d'être jugé par ses véritables Juges, on punit aussi-tôt son Silence et son Opiniatreté du supplice que nous appellons *Peine forte et dure*, c'est à dire, qu'on l'envoye en la Prison d'où il a été tiré, et là on le couche sur dos dans une basse Fosse, tout nud, les Parties honteuses étant seulement couvertes, les bras et les jambes attachées avec des Cordes aux quatre coins de la Chambre, on met ensuite sur son Corps autant de fer de pierre qu'il en peut porter et davantage. Le lendemain on luy donne trois morceaux de pain d'Orge sans boisson, le troisiéme jour on luy donne un peu d'eau telle qu'elle se trouve près de la Prison sans Pain. Et c'est là toute la nourriture qu'on luy donne tous les jours jusqu'à ce qu'il meure.' The whole of the chapter called 'Gémissement' is based on this extract from Chamberlayne; all Hugo's dramatic power and feeling for a dramatic situation have gone to make the scene more vivid. Hugo himself saw everything with absolute precision; so much so, that in the manuscript (p. 368) opposite the words 'La cave était vaste' we find a drawing of the prison—it looks like a deep round well, with the criminal stretched out in the centre, a stairs at one point and various words to show what the objects represent, as 'dalle,' 'fauteuil de bois,' etc. It is curious to note the points in Chamberlayne's account of the punishment, to which Hugo gave special attention.

Hugo has borrowed many names of officials from Chamberlayne, as Baker, clerk of the crown (II, p. 54), Brown, clerk of Parliament (II, p. 54) —in another part he gives the names of actual members of Parliament, Harley and Mungo Graham, but those he found in Beeverell's *Délices*;

but the officer who seems to have made the greatest impression on Hugo, and struck his imagination most deeply is the 'huissier de la verge noire sous Jaques II, le Chevalier Duppa' (I, p. 184, Chamberlayne). Again and again we find references to this court official, so that we incline to think it must have been something in the 'black wand' that appealed to Hugo. Chamberlayne describes him thus (I, p. 184): 'En la chambre de Présence du Roy il y a toûjours quatre Gentilshommes Servants ordinaires, dont le premier a cet honorable Office de la Verge Noire, et lorsque le Parlement est assemblé, il se tient toûjours à la porte ou dans la Chambre des seigneurs. Il est aussi Huissier de l'Ordre de la Jarretière, il a un siège hors de la barre ou balustrade dans la Chambre haute du Parlement, et lorsque le Roy commande à la Chambre des Communes de le venir trouver dans la Chambre des Pairs il leur envoye l'Huissier de la Verge noire, ainsi appellé à cause d'une Verge noire qu'il porte en sa main. Les pairs mettent sous sa garde ceux qu'ils jugent coupables de quelque faute qui le merite. C'est luy aussi qui prepare toutes les choses nécessaires dans la chambre haute auparavant que le Parlement s'assemble, et qui introduit les Seigneurs dans la même Chambre.' In this, we recognise to the full Hugo's 'huissier,' and realise that little creative work was done by Hugo's imagination.

The Wapentake, too, plays an important part in *L'Homme qui rit*. Here the name and the office both must have struck Hugo, but he does not introduce us to the Wapentake, who existed historically, and, as if to leave for himself a loophole of escape, he says, 'Nous croyons même que le mot wapentake a changé de sens. Il signifiait une magistrature, maintenant il signifie une division territoriale; il spécifiait le centenier, il spécifie le canton.'

Our first introduction to the Wapentake is dramatic. 'Gwynplaine?' 'Quoi?' 'Regarde,' 'Où?' 'Dans la place,' 'Et puis?' 'Vois-tu ce passant?' 'Cet homme en noir?' 'Oui.' So the dialogue goes on, and we realise that the man in black with the mace is terrible indeed and possesses terrible powers. Chamberlayne gives us a rather different and less dramatic meaning to the word Wapentake. 'Chaque Comté etant subdivisée en centaines, ainsi appellées au commencement, parce qu'elles contenoient cent Familles, ou cent hommes obligez de fournir des armes, ou en Wapentakes à cause d'un Weapon ou arme de fer qu'ils touchoient quand ils pretoient le Serment de fidelité, comme cela se fait encore en Suéde...chacune de ces Wapentakes ou centaines a pour l'Ordinaire un Baillif, qui est une Charge fort ancienne, mais maintenant fort peu

considérable' (Chamberlayne, II, p. 105). We can see what appealed to Hugo, the arm, the name Wapentake, the touching of the iron, and how he made a new creation out of the elements provided by Chamberlayne.

Chamberlayne describes (II, pp. 108—9), as does Victor Hugo, the sheriff of a province (Coyer gives more details in his *Nouvelles Observations sur l'Angleterre*); he differs from Hugo in his explanation of a 'justicier-quorum' (Chamberlayne, II, p. 102), but attaches the same meaning to 'sous-shériff.'

Chamberlayne in speaking of the Armada (II, p. 120) and again of the army (II, p. 174) explains what 'train-bands' are. Hugo uses this as matter for one of the bills, brought before the House of Lords when Gwynplaine sat among the peers.

For no apparent reason, Hugo mentions the laws of 'Rhodes et d'Oléron' when discoursing on English law; the paragraph is one of those added to the original manuscript. Something in this English interference in a French island must have struck Hugo as he read of these laws in Chamberlayne (II, p. 102), or it may have been that the name—'Rhodes et Oléron'—pleased him by its sonority. Neither can we understand why Hugo speaks of the three P's 'sine Prece, sine Pretio, sine Poculo,' unless again it be that it pleased his fancy, as it stood in Chamberlayne (I, p. 49).

These are the facts which Hugo borrowed from Chamberlayne's *État Présent de l'Angleterre*. Once or twice, Hugo quotes Chamberlayne as his authority, as he does in the case of Beeverell; but little do we realise in reading *The Laughing Man* how many the footnotes would be if Hugo acknowledged his whole debt! It is interesting to note how little, in one sense, Hugo's matter meant to him, and how great was his power of utilising whatever matter came into his hands. Think of the work, rather of the hard labour, that Flaubert would have gone through had he undertaken the reconstruction of early eighteenth century England! What scruples would he not have had! What documents would he not have examined! What accuracy in all his facts! What relevancy in all his descriptions, and fidelity in every detail! But the literary conscientiousness which was the principle behind all that Flaubert wrote and which in the end made his literary work real torture to him, was unknown to Hugo. He took what he found, as he found it; he did not examine the accuracy of its form; he took no trouble to reproduce it in the form in which it came to him. He cared not so much for accuracy as for an outward appearance of accuracy, not so much for reality as for its outward appearance; he did

not search far and wide that he might reconstruct England as it was; but he took what matter lay at his hand, and with that matter he reconstructed England from the facts which his imagination had to work upon; and this reconstruction of England according to the curious laws of his imagination left him free to expound his democratic ideas, his political theories, and the principles of his social philosophy.

And so perhaps we understand why Victor Hugo borrowed so largely from two books as little known, as unscientific, as old-fashioned and out-of-date as the *Délices de la Grande Bretagne* of Beeverell and the *État Présent de l'Angleterre* of Chamberlayne.

Christina M. Maclean.

Englefield Green.

NOTES ON LESSING'S 'BEYTRÄGE ZUR HISTORIE UND AUFNAHME DES THEATERS.'

LESSING'S first dramaturgic periodical is comparatively rare and has apparently not found its way to any of our English libraries. I have to thank the authorities of the University Library in Berlin for kindly placing their copy at my disposal for a few weeks.

It consists of four parts which form an octavo volume, measuring seven inches by a little over four, and containing 24 + 606 + 7 pages, 'Vorrede' and 'Register' being unpaged. The title-page of the first 'Stück' is 'Beyträge | zur | Historie und Aufnahme | des | Theaters. | [Vignette] | Erstes Stück. | Stuttgard, | bey Johann Benedict Metzler, 1750.' The contents are as follows:

Erstes Stück: Vorrede (22 unnumbered pages). i. Versuch eines Beweises, dass die Schauspielkunst eine freye Kunst sey, pp. 1—13. ii. Abhandlung von dem Leben, und den Werken des Marcus Accius Plautus, pp. 14—52. iii. Abhandlung von dem Nutzen und den Theilen des dramatischen Gedichts. Aus dem Französischen des Peter Corneille übersetzt, pp. 53—95. iv. Des Herrn von Voltaire Gedanken über die Trauer- und Lustspiele der Engländer, aus seinen Briefen über die Engländer übersetzt, pp. 96—109. v. Theatralische Neuigkeiten aus Paris, pp. 110—122. vi. Nachricht von dem gegenwärtigen Zustande des Theaters in Berlin, pp. 123—136.

Zweytes Stück: i. Die Gefangnen, ein Lustspiel. Aus dem Lateinischen des M. Accius Plautus übersetzt, pp. 139—210. ii. Die zweyte Abhandlung des Peter Corneille, von den Trauerspielen insbesondre, und von den Mitteln, sie nach der Wahrscheinlichkeit und Nothwendigkeit auszuführen. Aus dem Französischen übersetzt, pp. 211—265. iii. Untersuchung, ob man in Lustspielen die Charaktere übertreiben solle? pp. 266—272. iv. Nachricht von dem gegenwärtigen Zustande des Theaters in Dresden, pp. 273—282. v. Fortgesetzte Nachricht von dem gegenwärtigen Zustande des Theaters in

Berlin, pp. 283—286. vi. Theatralische Neuigkeiten aus Paris, pp. 287—293.

Drittes Stück: i. Clitia, ein Lustspiel in fünf Aufzügen. Aus dem Italienischen des Nicolaus Machiavell übersetzt, pp. 297—368. ii. Critik über die Gefangnen des Plautus, pp. 369—435. iii. Nachricht von dem gegenwärtigen Zustande des Theaters in Paris, pp. 436—468. iv. Samuel Werenfels Rede zu Vertheidigung der Schauspiele. Aus dem Lateinischen ins Deutsche übersetzt, und mit einigen Anmerkungen begleitet von M. Immanuel Friedr. Gregorius, aus Camenz, pp. 469—476.

Viertes Stück: i. Die Schauspielkunst, an die Madame *** durch den Herrn Franciscus Riccoboni, den jüngern. Aus dem Französischen übersetzt, pp. 481—544. ii. Die dritte Abhandlung des Peter Corneille, von den drey Einheiten, der Handlung, der Zeit, und des Orts, pp. 545—572. iii. Beschluss der Critik über die Gefangnen des Plautus, pp. 573—591. iv. Nachricht von dem gegenwärtigen Zustande des Theaters in Stutgard, pp. 592—595. v. Nachricht von einem in Freyberg aufgeführten Schulschauspiele, pp. 596—606. Followed by table of Contents and 'Register,' 7 pages (unpaged).

The only contemporary notices of the periodical mentioned by Goedeke are from the *Critische Nachrichten aus dem Reiche der Gelehrsamkeit*, 1750, No. 6, pp. 55 f.; No. 8, p. 72; No. 40, pp. 387 f.[1], but there were also notices in J. C. C. Oelrichs' *Berlinische Bibliothek*[2], published by C. F. Voss. The *Beyträge* was edited anonymously, and there is no indication in the journal as to who were the writers responsible for the individual articles.

When, in 1754, Lessing replaced the defunct *Beyträge* with the *Theatralische Bibliothek*, he wrote of the former:

> Von mir nehmlich schrieb sich nicht nur der gantze Plan jener periodischen Schrift her, so wie er in der Vorrede entworfen wird; sondern auch der grösste Theil der darinn enthaltenen Aufsätze ist aus meiner Feder geflossen. Ja ich kann sagen, dass die fernere Fortsetzung nur dadurch wegfiel, weil ich länger keinen Theil daran nehmen wollte. Zu diesem Entschluss brachten mich, Thiels verschiedene allzukühne und bittere Beurtheilungen, welche einer von meinen Mitarbeitern einrückte; Theils einige kleine Fehler, die von Seiten seiner gemacht wurden, und die nothwendig dem Leser von den Verfassern überhaupt einen schlechten Begrif beybringen mussten.

[1] *Grundriss*, III[3], p. 359.

[2] Band IV, St. i (1750), pp. 137–139: 'Daselbst [in Stuttgart] ist bey Joh. Bened. Metzler mit dem Anfang dieses Jahres eine periodische Schrift herausgekommen, welche folgenden Titul führet: Beyträge zur Historie und Aufnahme des Theaters. Erstes Stück. Wir haben gegenwärtig nicht nöthig, von dieser Schrift eine weitläuftige Nachricht zu geben, da solche schon bekannt genung ist, und mit vielem Beyfall aufgenommen worden. Die Abhandlungen sind ausgesucht. Der Inhalt ist dieser:...' And in the sixth 'Stück' (pp. 823 ff.) the remaining parts of the *Beyträge* are noticed.

And he instances, as an example, the statement about the Italian drama in the introduction to a translation of Macchiavelli's *Clitia*[1].

This 'Mitarbeiter,' whose name Lessing does not mention, was Christlob Mylius[2], who had died shortly before—March 7, 1754—in England. There is no doubt, that, whoever else may have made up the 'Gesellschaft,' Lessing and Mylius had the chief share in the *Beyträge*[3]; they were 'die Verfasser' who signed the 'Vorrede.'

With regard to the authorship of the individual items, the 'Abhandlung' on Plautus and the translation of *Die Gefangnen*[4] are by Lessing. This has never been questioned. The editorial notes to the 'Critik über die Gefangnen des Plautus' and the criticism of that 'Critik' in the third and fourth parts are obviously by the translator of the *Gefangnen*; and in a letter to his father[5], Lessing claimed the authorship of the review of Gregorius's translation of Werenfels. On the other side, we may, on Lessing's own authority, attribute to Mylius the translation of Macchiavelli's *Clitia* and the 'Untersuchung, ob man in Lustspielen die Charaktere übertreiben solle[6]'; and the opening article, 'Versuch eines Beweises, etc.' was also doubtless by him.

As far as direct evidence goes, this, however, is the most that can be said with certainty. The present opinion with regard to Lessing's share in the periodical depends, in the first instance, on a categorical statement by Karl Lessing in the Preface to Part xxii of the first collected edition of Lessing's works (1794)[7]. 'Das meiste darin,' he says of the *Beyträge*, 'sind Uebersetzungen, Theils aus dem Französischen, Theils aus dem Italiänischen. Diese könnten aber, und wenn es auch

[1] *Schriften* (my references are throughout to the Lachmann-Muncker edition), vi, pp. 3 f.

[2] Cp. E. Consentius in the *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, lii (1906), pp. 545 ff., and E. Thyssen's dissertation, *Christlob Mylius, sein Leben und Wirken* (Teildruck), Marburg, 1912.

[3] 'Er sammelte,' said C. H. Schmid, *Chronologie des deutschen Theaters*, 1775, p. 152 (ed. P. Legband, Berlin, 1902, p. 97), 'in Gesellschaft von Mylius, die Beyträge zur Aufnahme und Historie des Theaters, welche zu Stutgard herauskamen...' In the *Historia Myliana* (by J. C. Mylius, Jena, 1751, quoted by Danzel, *Lessing*, i, pp. 177 f.), it is stated that he wrote 'quasdam tractationes [in the *Beyträge*], de quo scripto 4 partes anno 1750 et 1751 Stuttgardiae in 8 prodierunt.'

[4] *Die Gefangnen, ein Lustspiel. Aus dem Lateinischen des M. Accius Plautus übersetzt*, was published separately by Metzler, Stuttgart, 1750. 72 pp. 8vo. (Goedeke, *l.c.*, and Muncker, iv, p. xi.) It was also reprinted, after Lessing's death, in *M. Accius Plautus, Lustspiele. Aus dem Lateinischen übersetzt.* Mit einer Vorrede von C. S. Mylius. i. Berlin, 1784 (Goedeke).

[5] November 2, 1750 (*Schriften*, xvii, p. 23).

[6] Preface to *Theatralische Bibliothek* and note to first article in that journal (*Schriften*, vi, pp. 3 f., 47; also 'Vorrede' to Mylius's *Vermischte Schriften* (*Schriften*, vi, p. 405). Jördens, *Lexikon*, iii (1808), p. 774, claims for Mylius 'unter andern' the three items mentioned above.

[7] Page iii. Cp. Danzel, *l.c.*

wirklich ausgemacht wäre, dass sie von Lessing herrührten, keinen Platz in der gegenwärtigen Sammlung finden. Von eignen Aufsätzen hat Lessing in den Beyträgen etc. gewiss weiter nichts, als was hier daraus abgedruckt worden ist, obgleich es in den so genannten Analekten etc. auch noch die Abhandlung: Versuch eines Beweises, dass die Schauspielkunst eine freye Kunst sey, ihm zugeschrieben wird.' And the works which Karl Lessing does reprint are: 'Das Leben des Plautus,' 'Die Gefangnen,' 'Critik über die Gefangnen,' and 'Werenfels' Rede.' This canon has been accepted by subsequent editors: the only changes being that, in the second Lachmann edition, the 'Vorrede' was added on the advocacy of Danzel[1], and has since been retained, and the Hempel edition[2] includes the translation of Riccoboni's *Art du Théâtre*, an ascription which Muncker has also accepted[3].

The *Beyträge* came to an end with the first number for reasons which Lessing has given in the passage just quoted. The 'kleinen Fehler' on the part of Mylius may be taken as referring to the preface to his translation of Macchiavelli; but what the 'verschiedenen allzukühnen und bitteren Beurtheilungen' were, it is not easy to say; for, as will be seen, there are difficulties in the way of accepting the usual explanation, namely, that Lessing was thinking of the last article in the journal[4]. The only other adverse criticism which the journal contains is to be found in the 'Critik über die Gefangnen' and in the review of Werenfels. Consentius has questioned Lessing's statement altogether[5], and argues that, as the very last number contains a promise of a continuation, the journal did not come to an end because Lessing and Mylius could not see eye to eye, but because the publisher refused to continue. But in the absence of any proof of the latter assertion, there seems little ground for doubting Lessing's statement of the matter; after all, the contents of the number—especially the 'Beschluss der Critik,' which contains the promise in question, and was originally intended for the third number—might well have been in type before the decision to discontinue the journal was arrived at.

However that may be, the abrupt demise of the *Beyträge* left much undone that Lessing had hoped to do[6]: some of the material collected for this journal, ultimately found its way into the *Theatralische*

[1] Vol. I, p. 178.
[2] Vol. XI, Part I, pp. ix f.
[3] *Schriften*, IV, pp. viii, 180.
[4] Goedeke, p. 359; and preface to Vol. XI, Part I of the Hempel edition of Lessing, p. ix.
[5] *Allg. deutsche Biographie*, LII, p. 553.
[6] Promises of future contributions will be found on pp. 14 (*Schriften*, IV, 57), 33 (69), 36 (71), 46 (78), 49 (79), 49 (80), 140 f. (84), 298, 375 (135), 397 (150), 591 (192 f.).

Bibliothek; and Danzel is probably right in inferring that the theatrical data and anecdotes, which Lessing published in the *Neueste aus dem Reiche des Witzes*, in December 1751[1], were originally intended for the present publication.

I. 'Vorrede.'

There is no reason to cavil at Danzel's conclusion that Lessing himself is responsible for the 'Vorrede,' which is dated 'Im October, 1749.' Danzel bases his argument on the passage from Lessing's Preface to the *Theatralische Bibliothek* which has just been quoted[2], and the note to the 'Critik über die Gefangnen des Plautus,' in which Lessing claims the right to break the rules he has himself made[3]. The style of the 'Vorrede' points, it seems to me, to Lessing rather than to Mylius, and I would add one more argument in support of this view, namely, the fact that Mylius, in his own first contribution[4], considered it necessary to supplement the programme of the 'Vorrede' with one of his own. Here he emphasises the intention of the journal to give consideration to 'die Ausübung theatralischer Stücke auf der Schaubühne'; but he hastens to add: 'Es ist von regelmässigen Schaubühnen die Rede, oder wenigstens von solchen, deren Aufseher sich der Regelmässigkeit befleissigen.'

Lessing—I shall assume without further question that it is he who is writing—makes no concealment of the fact that his chief object with this new journal is to prepare the way for Gottsched's promised 'Historie des Theaters[5]'; he will supplement the materials which Gottsched himself had been accumulating in the *Deutsche Schaubühne*. Thus

[1] *Schriften*, IV, pp. 471 ff.

[2] Also the passage from the same Preface (VI, p. 5): '...die Alten, mit welchen ich das noch gewiss zu leisten hoffe, was ich in der Vorrede zu den Beyträgen versprochen habe.'

[3] *Beyträge*, p. 383 (*Schriften*, IV, p. 141).

[4] 'Die Schauspielkunst eine freye Kunst,' pp. 1 f. This article had in the main been already published in Mylius's own 'Monatsschrift,' *Ermunterungen zum Vergnügen des Gemüths* (cp. E. Consentius, *A.D.B.*, LII, p. 553). Mylius's other, and very brief article in the *Beyträge*, 'Untersuchung, ob man in Lustspielen die Charaktere übertreiben solle'—which he answers in the affirmative—is of still less importance; its mention by Gellert (cp. Lessing's *Schriften*, VI, p. 47) is merely due to the fact that Mylius refers to that writer in complimentary terms.

[5] *Schriften*, IV, p. 54. In the 'Vorrede' to the last (sixth) volume of the *Schaubühne* (1745) Gottsched had said: 'Künftig erwarte der geneigte Leser von mir eine Historie der Schaubühne überhaupt, und unsrer deutschen insbesondre. Mein Vorrath deutscher Schauspiele von allen Gattungen, ist nun schon über anderthalbtausend Stücke gewachsen; und ich würde auch hier eine ziemliche Nachlese zu dem Verzeichnisse derselben mittheilen können, wenn es der Raum der Bogen zuliesse. Sie sollen aber künftig in ihrer Stelle erscheinen; nur ersuche ich die Liebhaber und Besitzer theatralischer Stücke hiermit nochmals, mir mit denjenigen Nachrichten an die Hand zu gehen, die mir etwa noch fehlen möchten.' Cp. also *Neuer Büchersaal*, I, iii (Sept. 1745), p. 287.

Gottsched's activity suggested, in the first instance, this journal dealing with the history of the drama; and that writer's periodicals, the *Beyträge zur critischen Historie der deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit* (1732–44), and more particularly, its successor, *Neuer Büchersaal der schönen Wissenschaften und freyen Künste* (1745–54)—both to a large extent modelled on the *Journal des Sçavans*—defined the form of the new journal[1]. It is true, Lessing reproaches his predecessors for having reduced the German theatre to monotony, by drawing their materials too exclusively from France; and he complains that the existing 'Monatsschriften' are inclined to neglect the drama. This was particularly noticeable in the case of the *Neue Büchersaal*, which had at first devoted much space to the drama, but ultimately ignored it almost entirely.

A comparison of the 'Vorrede' of Gottsched's journal with that of Lessing's emphasises the relations between them. Gottsched opens with an apology for adding one more to the many existing 'deutschen Monatsschriften,' but justifies himself on the ground of the increase of specialisation. 'Die schönen Wissenschaften und freyen Künste sind bisher noch mit keinem besondern Tagebuche versehen gewesen; und diesem augenscheinlichen Mangel, bin ich willen hierdurch einigermassen abzuhelfen' (p. 7). Lessing offers no apology, but feels a similar need of justifying his periodical; he specifies his field as 'nur den dramatischen Theil.' Neither journal will restrict itself to Germany. 'Nicht nur deutsche,' says Gottsched, 'sondern auch englische, französische, und italienische Sachen werden hier ihren Platz finden'; while Lessing desires that his journal shall be a contribution to the universal history of the theatre; he will not deal only with the ancient drama, but with the French, Italian, English, Spanish and Dutch drama, besides, of course, that in his own tongue. Here he had clearly in view that first 'comparative' history of the theatre, Luigi Riccoboni's *Réflexions historiques et critiques sur les Théâtres de l'Europe*, Paris, 1738. At the same time, the Greek and Latin drama was to have the chief share of attention; and the plan which Lessing draws out with regard to it was, no doubt, suggested by Brumoy's *Théâtre des Grecs*[2]. Of the modern drama he goes on to say: 'Wir werden besonders unser Augenmerk auf das englische und spanische

[1] The title is perhaps an echo, not merely of Gottsched's *Critische Beyträge*, but also of Bodmer's anti-Gottschedian *Critische Betrachtungen und freye Untersuchungen zum Aufnehmen und zur Verbesserung der deutschen Schaubühne*, Bern, 1743 (Goedeke, III, p. 11). Lessing refers to the *Neue Büchersaal* on p. 178.

[2] Cp. Danzel, *l.c.*, I, p. 179.

Theater richten.' This was not because Lessing had at this time any knowledge of or particular interest in either of these literatures; he knew, indeed, little more than was to be gleaned from Riccoboni's *Réflexions* and from Voltaire's *Lettres angloises*, where the English theatre is compared with the Spanish[1]. From Voltaire he obviously drew his list of English dramatists, omitting only Addison. Lessing's knowledge of the Spanish drama was even still hazier; and where the extraordinary list of names came from[2], is an enigma I have not yet been able to solve. With regard to the Italian and Dutch drama he makes a special reservation: 'Von den Italiänern and Holländern werden wir nur das, was sie regelmässiges und eigenthümliches haben, aufsuchen.' And the general conclusion to which this translating and criticising and comparing lead, is one towards which Elias Schlegel had been moving when he compared Gryphius with Shakespeare, and which Lessing himself was so brilliantly to establish: 'Das ist gewiss, wollte der Deutsche in der dramatischen Poesie seinem eignen Naturelle folgen, so würde unsre Schaubühne mehr der englischen als französischen gleichen.'

II. The Plautus Contributions.

It is hardly necessary to adduce evidence of Lessing's predilection for Plautus in his early days. In the Preface to the third part of his *Schrifften* (1754) he says: 'Theophrast, Plautus und Terenz waren meine Welt, die ich in dem engen Bezircke einer klostermässigen Schule, mit aller Bequemlichkeit studirte[3].' And Lessing's interest in the Roman dramatist is to be seen, not merely in his contributions to the present journal, but also in his drama, *Der Schatz*; the sketch of *Weiber sind Weiber*, which is built up on motives from the *Stichus*, borrows the name 'Labrax' from the *Rudens*, and, like *Die alte Jungfer*, is provided with a motto from Plautus. Further, *Justin* was planned as a version of the *Pseudolus*, a drama which probably also influenced in part *Der junge Gelehrte*[4].

[1] From the translation in the *Beyträge* (p. 96): 'Die Engländer hatten, sowohl wie die Spanier, schon ihre Schaubühne, als die Franzosen noch auf Brettern spielten. Shakespear, der der Engländer Corneille war, blühte mit dem Lopez de Vega beynahe zu einer Zeit.'

[2] Cp. C. Pitollet, *Contributions à l'étude de l'hispanisme de G. E. Lessing*, Paris, 1909, pp. 72 ff.

[3] *Schriften*, v, p. 268.

[4] Danzel, *Lessing*, I, p. 143; E. Schmidt, *Lessing*, I³, p 138.

(*a*) *Abhandlung von dem Leben, und den Werken des Marcus Accius Plautus.*

Danzel was of the opinion that Lessing's discussion of Plautus in the *Beyträge* was prompted in the first instance by a desire to supplement the *Théâtre des Grecs* of Brumoy[1]. Without unduly underrating the initial influence of Brumoy, I believe that Lessing had a much more immediate model for his 'Abhandlung' in the *Bibliotheca Latina* of J. A. Fabricius (Hamburg, 1697; second edition, 1721), or in the German counterpart of that work, G. E. Müller's *Historisch-critische Einleitung zu nöthiger Kenntniss und nützlichem Gebrauche der alten lateinischen Schriftsteller*, II. Theil, Dresden, 1747[2]. Lessing's article is similar in form to the sections on Plautus in these books, that is to say, a general account of the poet's life and work is followed by brief notes on the individual plays and a list of editions of Plautus. At the same time, Lessing by no means follows either Fabricius or Müller in his actual matter; here he seems to have been most indebted to the 'Dissertation préliminaire sur la vie et les œuvres de Plaute' which is prefixed to H. P. de Limiers' *Les Œuvres de Plaute en Latin et en Français*, Traduction nouvelle, Amsterdam, 1719, 10 volumes. This he supplemented by the authoritative edition of Plautus by Taubmann; and evidence also seems to point to his having consulted the later edition of Taubmann by Gruter and the edition 'in usum Delphini' by Operarius[3]. In Taubmann are to be found all the Latin passages quoted by Lessing, with the exception of that from Cicero's *Brutus*.

Lessing's method of using these sources is perhaps best illustrated by quoting the opening page or two from Limiers:

> Quoiqu'il en soit, Plaute est un de ceux dont on sait le moins de particularités, et la vie est aussi obscure que le Lieu et le tems de sa Naissance. On croit pourtant, et il semble même qu'on n'en peut pas douter, qu'il nâquit à Sarcines, Ville d'Ombrie, située au pié de l'Appennin [Note: Sarcines étoit autrefois une Ville d'Ombrie.... Pour ce qui est de la situation de cette Ville, qui ne se trouve plus sur nos Cartes, voici ce qu'en dit *Strabon*, etc.]; et l'on prétend qu'il a lui-même indiqué cette Ville pour sa patrie dans l'une de ses Comédies [*Mostellaire*, III, ii, 83]. Mais pour ce qui est du tems auquel il est né, c'est de quoi l'on n'a aucune certitude.... Pour ce qui est de son Origine, elle étoit des plus viles, et l'on prétend même que ses Ancêtres étoient Esclaves; tellement que pour désigner un homme de basse extraction, on disoit en commune proverbe, qu'il étoit de la race de Plaute [Note:

[1] Danzel, I, pp. 180 f.

[2] Müller's work was reviewed in Gottsched's *Neuer Büchersaal*, Vol. VII, pp. 32 ff., where the section on Plautus was discussed at length.

[3] *M. Acci Plauti Lat. Comoediae facile principis Fabulae XX. superstites.* Cum novo et luculento Commentario F. Taubmani, Wittenberg, 1605. The edition by J. Gruter was published in 1621; that of Jacobus Operarius, 2 vols., Paris, 1679.

Quod e vulgatissimo illo verbo, quod apud Minutium felicem occurrit, etc., Pareus]....
Tout ce qu'on sait de sa vie, c'est qu'étant tout à fait denué des biens de la fortune. il fit valoir le talent qu'il avoit pour la Comédie; qu'aiant gagné quelque chose par ce moyen-là, il s'adonna au Négoce ; et que le Négoce ne lui aiant point réussi, il vint à Rome, après avoir perdu tout l'argent qu'il avoit gagné par ses compositions, et que là il fut réduit, pour vivre, à se mettre au service d'un Meûnier.... Il est beaucoup plus plausible de croire que Plaute s'étant mis au service du Meûnier, ou parce qu'il avoit perdu tout son argent dans le Commerce, ou, selon d'autres, dans le tems d'une grande cherté de vivres, il reprit ensuite son premier Métier d'Auteur, qui l'aida aparemment à subsister le reste de sa vie. Ce fut pendant qu'il tournoit la meule, qu'il composa deux Pièces [Note: Ces deux Pièces étoient intitulées l'une Satyrio et l'autre Addictus]. dont il ne nous reste que les noms, et une troisième à ce qu'on prétend, dont nous ne savons pas même le titre....Admirable facilité du génie de Plaute, qui, quoiqu'occupé à des travaux serviles, ne laissoit pas de conserver toute la Liberté d'esprit nécessaire pour répandre dans ses Ouvrages cette gayeté et ce naturel que nous y admirons encore aujourd'hui ![1]

This clearly provided the basis for the first two or three pages of Lessing's account. Saggitarius's work he found referred to in his bibliographical sources; the variant 'Attius' is mentioned by Festus and discussed by Operarius in his Preface; Taubmann (p. 1305) supplied the note from Janus Parrhasius about Sarsina, and Zedlitz's *Universal-lexikon*, s.v. afforded further geographical information. The reference to the 'Aediles' (p. 59, l. 5) is based on a note of Taubmann's to the passage quoted from the *Amphitruo*[2]; and Athenaeus and Laertius quoted after Limiers' notes on p. 7: 'Pour ce qui est de l'extrémité à laquelle Plaute fut réduit de se louer à un Meûnier pour vivre, il eut cela de commun avec Ménédème, Asclépiade et Cléanthe, trois Philosophes très renommés.' With reference to the *Addictus*, Limiers' translation, 'le Valet obéissant[3],' is controverted in a note, the substance of which is drawn from Taubmann's comment on *Bacchides*, v, ii, 86 (p. 523); and the passages from the anonymous interpreter of Virgil and from Festus are quoted by both Limiers and Taubmann. The attribution to Plautus of the nickname 'Asinus' is discussed by Taubmann in the introduction to the *Amphitruo*. The 'spanische Schriftsteller' referred to by Taubmann (p. 1306)[4], Lessing conjectures, was 'Antonius de Guevara.' C. Pitollet has shown[5] that he was thinking of Guevara's *Menosprecio de corte y alabanza de aldea*, in the translation of Aegidius Albertinus. In the edition I have before me (*Mühseeligkeit dess Hoffs und Glückseeligkeit des Landlebens, anfänglich in Hispanischer Sprach beschrieben durch H. Anton de Guevara*, Verteutscht

[1] Dissertation préliminaire, I, pp. 2—8.
[2] Page 11; but Madame Dacier has also a note: 'Il étoit de la charge des Édiles d'avoir soin de tout ce qui concernoit les jeux publics, ils y présidoient, ils mettoient le prix aux pièces, et ils les payoient' (Limiers, I, p. 15).
[3] Vol. x, p. 10.
[4] Taubmann's reference is also quoted by Limiers, I, pp. 5 f. note.
[5] *Contributions à l'étude de l'hispanisme de G. E. Lessing*, Paris, 1909, pp. 77 ff.

durch Aegidium Albertinum, Cölln, 1643) the passage occurs on p. 21: 'Plautus [Guevara, however, wrote 'Plato'] der Philosophus war in seiner Jugend liederlich genung, dann er lief dem Krieg nach, und fuhr auffm Meer, er war auch ein Beck, und handelte mit Kaufmanschaft, verkaufft Oel, und lernete das Schneider Handwerck,' etc.

On the death of Plautus Limiers has not a great deal to say; but Lessing is again, I think, indebted to him when he speaks of Plautus's personal appearance (p. 8):

> À l'égard de son air et de sa Physionomie, on prétend qu'il s'est peint lui-même dans sa Comédie du Trompeur. Je ne sai sur quoi les Interprêtes peuvent fonder cette opinion; mais ils s'accordent tous à dire, sans en aporter de preuves, qu'on trouve là le véritable portrait de Plaute. Si cela est, il n'étoit rien moins que beau; ou bien le goût des Anciens étoit aussi extrémement différent du nôtre sur cet article.

Limiers then quotes the Latin lines which Lessing reprints[1]. Note 'm' on page 63 on the meaning of the word 'Plautus' would seem to have been directly suggested by a passage in the Preface to Operarius's edition. With regard to the line from the *Mostellaria*, III, ii, 83[2], Limiers had commented on it as follows: 'Voilà bien la plus froide plaisanterie qu'il y ait dans mon Auteur. C'est une allusion du mot d'*Ombre* à celui d'*Ombrie*, Patrie de Plaute, auquel il oppose le nom de *Sarcines*, Ville de cette Province[3].' The play on the word 'Umbra' is discussed by Taubmann and the other commentators. The 'Grabschrift' is also given by Limiers (p. 18), but Lessing's text is in accordance with Taubmann (p. 1306). On p. 23 of his preliminary Dissertation Limiers passes 'au nombre des Comédies de Plaute.' He also quotes both Cicero *De Officiis*, xxix, and Hieronymus (cp. Lessing's text, p. 67), but these 'testimonies' are, of course, also in Taubmann. It is possible, however, that Limiers' comment on Hieronymus[4] suggested to Lessing his discussion of the attitude of the Christian to the theatre. Lessing next considers the criticism of Plautus in Horace's *De Arte poetica*, 371 ff. which he quotes, text as well as translation, from Gottsched's *Critische Dichtkunst*. He had, however, found the controversy referred to, not only by Madame Dacier and Camerarius—whose Dissertation was accessible to him in Gruter's or in Operarius's edition, but also in Heinsius, *Ad Horatii de Plauto et Terentio judicium*, which is printed, as Lessing indicates, in the edition of Terence, 'in

[1] *Pseudolus*, IV, vii, 120 ff. 'Ventricosus' in the first line is a misprint for 'ventriosus.'

[2] '3 Auft.' is a misprint.

[3] Vol. IV, pp. 380 f.

[4] Page 21: 'On a peine à concevoir comment ce S. Père de l'Église pouvoit lire Plaute sans scrupule pour se délasser; il choisissoit sans doute les plus pures d'entre ses Comédies,' etc.

usum Delphini' (Paris, 1675). Lessing's text, page 70, l. 23 to page 71, l. 18, is a translation from the unpaged Preface to Madame Dacier's translation: *Comédies de Plaute, traduites en François*, par Mademoiselle Le Fèvre, Tome I, Paris, 1683, also included in Limiers' edition, I, pp. 43 ff.

Lessing defends his list of editions of Plautus in a note to the 'Critik': '... dass meine Absicht gar nicht gewesen, alle Ausgaben des Plautus anzuführen[1].' But his list makes, all the same, a distinctly secondhand impression. Possibly he made merely a selection from that published by Fabricius or Müller; in any case, it is noticeable that he omits from it both the Strassburg edition of 1508, edited by Mulingus, to which he himself refers, as well as the Plantine edition of 1609, which he used[2].

Lessing next proceeds to discuss modern translations of 'dieser Vater aller Comödienschreiber,' a characterisation of Plautus probably suggested by Limiers, who describes him (p. 18) as 'le père de la Comédie.' The translation of Madame Dacier has just been referred to; Volume I contains *Amphitryon*, II *Rudens*, and III *Epidicus*. All three plays were published in 1683, and are included in Limiers' work. In her Preface she says: 'Je ne donne que trois Comédies, si elles ont quelque succès, j'ai dessein de donner en peu de tems quelques Comédies d'Aristophane, de prendre ensuite tour à tour les Tragiques Grecs, et de revenir après cela à Plaute, dont je traduirai toutes les pièces qui peuvent être mises en notre langue[3].' The title of 'Herr Cost's' translation is: *Les Captifs, Comédie de Plaute, traduite en François, avec des Remarques*, par M. Coste. Amsterdam, D. Mortier, 1716. It was taken over into the second volume of Limiers' work as 'seconde édition revûe et corrigée,' and supplemented by a 'Dissertation sur la Durée de l'Action des Captifs.' I shall have occasion to return to this. In his Preface Limiers says (p. 33): 'Je n'ai eu le secours d'aucun Manuscrit, ce qui m'auroit pourtant été d'une très grande utilité; mais j'ai du moins eu l'avantage de recouvrer une Édition assez ancienne et assez rare, qui est celle d'*Aldus*. J'ai eu aussi entre les mains des Remarques MSS. du célèbre Mr *Gronovius*, dont j'ai souvent fait usage.' When Lessing writes, 'man muss seine Geschicklichkeit loben, mit welcher er die anstössigen Stellen eingekleidet hat,' I am inclined to think, in view of his subsequent attitude to the matter, that he is merely echoing

[1] Page 138. The comment on Merula probably came from Zedlitz's *Lexikon*, XX (1739), p. 1054, where it is said of him: 'Er lehrte 40 gantzer Jahre so wohl zu Venedig als Mayland die Jugend'; Zedlitz also comments on Taubmann's 'schertzhaffte Reden und lustige Einfälle' (XLII, 1744, p. 215). I have been unable to trace in English libraries the edition of Plautus by Samuel Patrick to which Lessing refers.

[2] Pages 150, 168.

[3] Limiers, I, pp. 65 f.

Limiers' introduction, pp. 30 f. The 'Stelle aus seiner Vorrede' which Lessing translates, is on pp. 36 f., the footnotes being part of the original.

The full title of the second complete French translation of Plautus is: *Les Comédies de Plaute. Nouvellement traduites en stile libre, naturel et naïf; avec des Notes et des Réflexions enjouées, agréables et utiles de Critique, d'Antiquité, de Morale et de Politique,* par M. Gueudeville. 10 Tomes, Leiden, 1719[1]. The other translation into French, that by Marolles, as well as that of 'Herrn Cokes' into English, Lessing only knew of by repute; the English one was merely a translation of the *Amphitruo* (1746), and the author's name was Cooke. Of German translations of Plautus, Lessing had evidently before him Joachim Greff's version of the *Aulularia* (Magdeburg, 1535). It had been mentioned by Gottsched in his *Critische Beyträge* (Vol. I, p. 33), and in the 'Nachlese des Verzeichnisses aller deutschen gedruckten Schauspiele,' in Vol. III of the *Deutsche Schaubühne* (1741, p. xx). In the 'Verzeichniss' itself (Vol. II, p. 49) Lessing had found 'Captivi der gefangenen Leute. Treu aus dem M. Accio Plauto übersetzt, durch M. Mart. Hayneccium, 1582.'

The meagre notices of the individual plays are on the lines of those in Fabricius and Müller; but they are no mere copy of these, being for the most part drawn from the 'arguments' and introductory notices in Taubmann's edition, and from the introductions to Limiers' translations. Only a few points require comment. The passage from Bayle's *Dictionnaire* on the *Amphitruo,* which Lessing controverts, is from the article on 'Amphitryon[2].' The reference to Arnobius is also here. In the notice of the *Aulularia,* he took over from Fabricius: 'Antonius Codrus, Professor Bononiensis, qui clarebat sub Sigismundo et Friderico III Impp.,' but apparently did not know that 'Bononia' was Bologna! Where Lessing learned about Dryden's *Two Sosias, La Emilia* by Luigi Groto[3], which originally appeared in 1579, although the edition with the French translation is of 1609, and Cecchi's version of the *Mercator,* I am unable to say; but Helena Balletti Riccoboni's version of the *Rudens* was published in Vol. V of Riccoboni's *Le Nouveau Théâtre Italien,* which was possibly one of the sources of the third article

[1] It is perhaps worth noting that the list of 'anstössige Stellen' at the end of this edition, which calls forth Lessing's sharp comment, is taken direct from the edition of Plautus 'in usum Delphini'!

[2] In Gottsched's German edition, Vol. I, p. 200; the passage is quoted by Boxberger (*Deutsche Nationalliteratur,* LXIV), p. 129.

[3] 'Cicco' is, of course, a misprint for 'Cieco'; also in the notice of the *Asinarius,* 'Dimophilus' for 'Demophilus.'

on the Paris theatres. With regard to the 'better' title of the last-mentioned play, Madame Dacier had said in her Preface to her translation: 'J'ai changé son nom de *Rudens*, qui signifie *cable*, en celuy d'*Heureux Naufrage*, qui est plus doux, et qui explique le principal incident de la Pièce.' Regnard's *Le Retour imprévu* and *Menaechmes*[1] Lessing probably knew at first-hand. *Stichus, ou le Triomphe de la foi conjugale* is in Vol. VIII of Limiers' work, pp. 319 ff.

The detail with which I have dealt with the sources of Lessing's knowledge in his 'Abhandlung' may have seemed unnecessary; but my purpose in estimating as exactly as possible these sources will appear more evident when I come to consider the 'Critik über die Gefangnen des Plautus.' Something, however, has first to be said concerning the translation of and notes to the play itself.

(*b*) *Die Gefangnen, ein Lustspiel. Aus dem Lateinischen des Plautus übersetzt.*

It is, I think, evident that Lessing's translation of the *Captivi* belongs to an earlier date than the 'Abhandlung' on Plautus in the first part of the *Beyträge*. From notes to the 'Critik' in the third part we learn that, in making the translation, he had not Limiers' volume containing Coste's translation 'bey der Hand,' and that the edition, 'die ich meistentheils bey meiner Arbeit gebraucht,' was the 'Plantinische von 1609 in 16.' although he also implies that he consulted Taubmann's edition[2].

It thus does not seem an unreasonable conjecture to say that the translation was, in the first instance, made from the tiny Plautus edition Lessing mentions[3], possibly the copy he used at school; and that he turned to Taubmann at a later stage. Before publishing *Die Gefangnen*, he had, of course, also the advantage of revising it and comparing it with Coste's French translation in the second volume of Limiers' edition. The influence of that translation is obvious on Lessing's notes, and is, I think, also occasionally to be traced on the text itself[4].

[1] Limiers' introduction to the *Menaechmi* (Vol. v, p. 14) also mentions Regnard's play. It is interesting to note that, although Lessing does not yet know of Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors*, Müller mentions it (p. 38).

[2] Pages 138, 149 f.

[3] *M. Acci Plauti Comoediae viginti. Ex Officina Plantiniana*, 1609. This is a little duodecimo volume, measuring only $2\frac{1}{8} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ inches, and consisting of 719 pages of minute print. It has neither introduction nor notes.

[4] See below, p. 525.

Judged by modern standards, Lessing's translation has no great value; it is often awkward and crude, and inaccuracies were unavoidable. It is, however, more literal than Coste's, much more so than Gueudelette's, and it is not disfigured by those perversions of the original in the interests of polite French taste, of which Coste is guilty[1]. The principles which Lessing, in his Preface, says have guided him, were, like those on the observance of the proprieties in the 'Abhandlung,' no doubt, influenced to some extent by Limiers' views as to how a translator of Plautus should proceed[2].

Lessing's notes on the text are meagre; but he himself apologises for them, and proposes to publish a more detailed commentary in 'einer besondren Abhandlung[3].' The notes which he would seem to have inserted solely on his own responsibility, are of little or no value; and this must also be said of his attempts to emend the Plautine text[4]. A number bear witness to his use of Taubmann's commentary[5], from which comes also the quotation from Douza in the 'Vorbericht[6]'; others, again, have been suggested by the notes in the French translation. A few of these are perhaps worth additional comment.

Page 87. The reference to 'Trauerspiele zum Lachen und Lustspiele zum Weinen' may have been suggested by Coste, p. 213: 'Plaute se moque ici de quelques Comédies de son temps, où le Poète avoit fait entrer des Incidens purement Tragiques. Qu'auroit-il dit de quelques Modernes qui ont donné des Pièces de Théâtre composées de deux Sujets très-distincts, l'un Tragique, et l'autre Comique ou même Burlesque? Il se seroit sans doute bien moqué de ces Pièces, et de ceux qui les ont honorées de leurs applaudissemens.'

Page 92. Taubmann, who refers (p. 208) to Scaliger's 'gelehrte Untersuchung,' has 'cirim' in his text, but 'irim' in his note, where,

[1] For example, the opening lines of Act I, sc. i, which Coste translates: 'Les jeunes gens me donnent des titres qui conviennent admirablement (!) à ma Profession de Parasite.'

[2] Cp. Lessing, p. 83: 'Sie werden uns mit Erbarmung ansehen' etc. with Limiers, I, p. 32: 'Pour ce qui est des jeux de mots, très fréquens dans Plaute, qui roulent uniquement sur des expressions particulières à la Langue Latine, et de certains tours si éloignés de notre usage qu'il est impossible de les rendre en François, je me suis servi, autant que j'ai pu, de façons de parler équivalentes: j'ai cherché dans notre Langue et dans nos manières ce qui étoit le plus capable de répondre à la pensée de mon Auteur, et j'ai rendu compte dans les Remarques des différences qui pouvoient se rencontrer entre les unes et les autres.'

[3] The reply to the 'Critik' obviously contains matter ('unsere Gedanken von dem Gebrauch der Wortspiele') which should have formed part of this 'Abhandlung.'

[4] Pages 86[2], 96, 110, 111, 119, 126[2]. The only one of these that would seem to have found some measure of acceptance is that to Act III, sc. iv, 79 (p. 110).

[5] E.g., pages 86, 88 (on the ambiguity of 'invocatus'), 91, 92, 96, 105, 107, 115, 118, 120, 121.

[6] Page 83, cp. Taubmann, p. 195.

however, the explanation 'ciris, alauda nostra' is given. Coste has (p. 231) 'erem,' which he translates 'hérisson.' But see below, p. 530.

Page 97. The comma is to be found in Taubmann's text amongst others, but is omitted in Coste's Latin text (p. 254). Coste adds: 'Il s'approche de Tyndare qu'il prend pour Philarète.'

Page 99. Lessing's translation of l. 86: 'Tam hoc quidem tibi in proclivi, quam imber est, quando pluit,' is: 'Die Sache wird gehen, als ob sie geschmiert wäre'; Coste's: 'Cela ira de soi-même.' The latter adds a note (p. 259): 'C'est une expression proverbiale qui ne peut être traduite avec grace dans notre Langue.'

Page 107. There is a long note here, both in Taubmann (p. 231) and Coste (pp. 294 f.). The latter concludes: 'Mais à présent je suis convaincu que dans ces trois passages Plaute n'a parlé de l'Epilepsie et de la manière dont on pouvoit en être gueri que selon les idées superstitieuses et populaires qui étoient reçues de son temps.' His translation is: 'Il est souvent attaqué de cet horrible mal, qui fait qu'on crache à la vue de ceux qui en sont attaqués.' In his first edition, however, he had (p. 117): 'Il est souvent attaqué du mal, qui fait écumer.'

Page 122. Coste's note is (p. 360): 'Ergasilus joue sur le mot *Boia* qui signifie *Carcan*, et la femme d'un Boien, (c'est le nom d'un Peuple des Gaules), mais outre que l'équivoque porte sur une idée obscène[1], et que la plaisanterie est en elle-même obscure et insipide; c'est un jeu de mots si fort attaché à la Langue Latine qu'il est impossible de la traduire en François. Ce que j'ai mis à la place, est tout au moins facile à entendre.'

Page 128. Coste (pp. 384 f.): 'C'est un jeu fondé sur la double signification du mot *upupa* qui signifie l'oiseau qu'on nomme en François *une hupe*, et un Instrument de fer qui ressemble assez au bec de cet oiseau, et qu'on appelle *houe* ou *pic*.'

(c) *Critik über die Gefangnen des Plautus.*

The 'Critik über die Gefangnen des Plautus' in the third part of the *Beyträge* was attributed to Lessing by his brother Karl, and all subsequent editors have accepted his decision and included it in Lessing's works. It has been urged that the insertion of letters purporting to come from outside contributors was a familiar device in the journalism of the time, from the *Spectator* onwards, and that Lessing employed it here in order to give variety to the contents of his journal.

[1] This passage is quoted in the 'Critik' (p. 150), where 'obscure' is an error for 'obscène.'

Instead of publishing the promised criticism of Plautus's comedy, as he had intended, he introduced a note of piquancy by throwing his ideas into a form of criticism ostensibly hostile to himself. But we have only to subject the 'Critik' to a careful scrutiny to see that it could not possibly be by Lessing. Even purely external characteristics of language and style point against Lessing's authorship. Danzel, who recognised the difference of style[1], admired the skill with which Lessing converted himself for the occasion into a good Gottschedian; although, as a matter of fact, the Lessing of the *Beyträge* was more orthodox in respect of Gottsched's creed than his co-editor. Danzel quotes a single phrase that reminds him of Gottsched; but there are many expressions and stylistic turns that were distinctly foreign to Lessing at this time[2]. Then, again, the whole criticism is put together so clumsily and with so little of that logical method which was characteristic of Lessing, even in his earliest beginnings, that this alone speaks against his authorship. One has only to read the letter together with Lessing's own comment on it and reply to it, to be convinced that both could not have come from the same pen. The truth of the matter is, Karl Lessing rather hastily assumed that, because his brother promised a 'besondre Abhandlung,' the 'Critik' must necessarily be the fulfilment of that promise, more especially as it was written with what seemed to be unusual fulness of knowledge[3].

An examination of the 'Critik' in detail further justifies this point of view. Its publication in the *Beyträge* in the form of a letter may have been suggested by Coste's own introduction to his second edition, as printed by Limiers. Coste's translation had been criticised in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* for March–April, 1716, pp. 280 ff., where he had been taken to task for having said that 'cette Comédie est exactement conformé aux règles.' To this criticism Coste replied in the July–August number (pp. 464 ff.), and this reply is reprinted as a 'Dissertation sur la Durée de l'action des Captifs' in the Coste-Limiers edition of the translation. 'J'avois crû,' he says, 'pouvoir me

[1] *Op. cit.*, I, p. 181.

[2] E.g., 'anitzo' (p. 140, l. 14; 142, 14); 'so' as relative (p. 132, l. 21; 134, 14, 15; 135, 6; 141, 27; 158, 27; 170, 20, 33); the predilection for words like 'artig' (p. 132, l. 3; 138, 9; 142, 2; 147, 10; 159, 11; 167, 20, 22) and 'absonderlich' (p. 142, l. 4; 148, 7; 150, 19; 169, 23). The phrase which Danzel notes is 'denn so hätten wir es hernach auch gewusst (p. 141, l. 2).

[3] It is perhaps worth noting that C. H. Schmid in his 'Life of Plautus,' in *Biographie der Dichter*, I (Leipzig, 1769), pp. 220 f. has no suspicion that it might be by Lessing; he says the volume contains a criticism, 'die sehr viele Kleinigkeiten tadelt (selbst die schleunige Zurückkunft des Philokrates rechne ich dahin), das beleidigte Costüme, und die verschwiegne Ursache von Stalagmus Ankunft ausgenommen und eine Widerlegung dieser Kritik, die desto leichter fiel, je seichter die Kritik selbst war....'

dispenser de donner un Examen suivi des *Captifs* pour en justifier la durée, parce que la Pièce me paroissoit fort regulière à cet égard. Depuis, j'ai été convaincu par les Objections d'un habile homme que cette régularité n'étoit pas si palpable et que je n'en avois eû moi-même qu'une idée très-incomplète, lors que je donnai ma Traduction au Public.' Then follows the reply from the *Nouvelles*.

The author of the 'Critik' makes no pretence to classical scholarship, and does not venture to criticise Lessing on this ground; but he has a wide knowledge of French literature of the theatre—wider, no doubt, than Lessing as yet had—and his mode of attack is to confront Lessing with arguments drawn in the main from French sources. From the little that Lessing had said of Coste's translation in his 'Abhandlung' he assumes that Lessing did not know it except by repute[1], he being clearly unaware that the second edition, which he deplores Coste had never published, actually appeared in Limiers' work[2]. Had he known that Lessing made liberal use of this, he would, no doubt, have been more chary of supplementing the defects of Lessing's knowledge by arguments drawn from it.

He begins by criticising with studious politeness the very ambitious scheme of the *Beyträge*, and quotes, in illustration of its difficulties, a passage from the Preface to Vol. I of the *Histoire du Théâtre françois* of the brothers François and Claude Parfaict (Amsterdam, 1735). He expresses the hope that due attention will be given to the subject of Declamation—he draws Lessing's attention to the *Traité de Récitatif* of Grimarest[3]—and he refers to the opera, agreeing with the opinion of Gottsched, 'eines Dichters unserer Zeit,' that it is a serious blemish on the theatrical activity of the day[4].

After these preliminaries he turns to Plautus, and objects that Lessing seems disposed to paint him in too uniformly favourable a light. He takes Coste's Introduction—to his first edition—as a basis for his argument; quotes from it a passage from Racine's 'Examen' of

[1] 'Ich bin daher auf den Argwohn gekommen, dass Sie vielleicht diese Uebersetzung nicht selbst gesehen haben...' (p. 138).

[2] 'Man sieht aus verschiednen Stellen, dass Herr Coste eine zweyte Ausgabe mit verschiedenen Verbesserungen davon zu liefern Vorhabens gewesen ist, so aber meines Wissens unerfüllt geblieben' (p. 138). When he says on the following page, 'Wenn Sie an des Limiers Uebersetzung des Plautus seine Geschicklichkeit rühmen, mit welcher er die anstössigen Stellen übersetzt, so verdient Coste eben dieses Lob,' he clearly shows his ignorance of Limiers' work.

[3] A German translation of this treatise appeared later in the *Sammlung vermischter Schriften zur Beförderung der schönen Wissenschaften und freyen Künste* (published by Nicolai), IV, ii and v, ii, Berlin, 1761–62.

[4] *Versuch einer critischen Dichtkunst* (2nd ed., 1737), II, xii, pp. 715, 718; on p. 159 the critic describes Gottsched as 'ein grosser Kunstrichter.'

his *Bérénice,* and a sentence from Balzac[1], and approves of Coste's attitude towards Plautus's offences against good taste. After giving, in an offensively informative tone[2], the exact title of Coste's translation, he proceeds to translate directly from the Introduction[3]. He then supplements, in the same superior tone, Lessing's ignorance of the 1743 German translation of the *Aulularia.* His next point is to take Lessing to task for his expression 'der Vater aller Comödienschreiber': but he naturally finds his best opportunity in attacking the unreasonable claim that the *Captivi* is 'das vortrefflichste Stück, welches jemals auf das Theater gekommen.' Had Lessing said the best of Plautus's comedies, no objection could have been raised, but the critic does not understand why a play should have been selected for translation which had so little interest for posterity that no one ever imitated it.

The critic directs his attack mainly against two aspects of the *Captivi,* against its obscenity and its defective, irregular construction; he holds it (p. 142) to be both 'unanständig und unwahrscheinlich.' His argument is, in the first case, based on Coste, in the second, on Ménage's *Discours sur l'Heautontimorumenos de Térence* (Utrecht, 1690), pp. 14—16, but it seems more than likely that he was familiar with the criticism that had been very generally brought against Coste in the French press for his defence of Plautus's observance of the unities[4]. On the authority of Ménage he shows that Plautus was not himself responsible for the division of his plays into acts and scenes; and he draws attention to certain irregularities of this nature. Act II is wrongly divided, he says, into three, instead of into two scenes (Lessing had already had a note on this[5]); in Act II scenes 4 and 5 should be one, an opinion which Lessing disputes in his note; and the fourth scene of Act IV should be the first of Act V, with which Lessing agrees.

He now goes on to discuss the defects of the play in respect of the

[1] The passage from Balzac is not, however, quoted by Coste; it will be found (in Latin) in F. Vavasseur, *De ludicra Dictione liber...Accedunt Epistolae selectae L. Balzacii,* Leipzig, 1722, p. 671. What the immediate (French) source was, I am unable to say.

[2] It is surely inconceivable that Lessing—reverting for a moment to the view that he was the author—should have taken the trouble to indulge in this unnecessary masquerading.

[3] Page 138, l. 18—page 139, l. 6. Cp. Coste-Limiers, pp. v—viii.

[4] Besides that in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* already referred to, there were criticisms of a similar tenor in the *Histoire critique de la République des Lettres,* XIII, Amsterdam, 1717, pp. 1 ff.; the *Journal littéraire,* XI (1720), pp. 137 ff.; the *Journal Historique,* Amsterdam, 1719, p. 19; *Bibliothèque ancienne et moderne,* XI, pp. 220 ff.; *Mémoires de Trévoux,* 1720, pp. 806 ff. In the Introduction to his translation of Plautus, Gueudelette singles out the same two points for special discussion.

[5] It is again inconceivable that Lessing, having already decided this matter, should have brought it up again.

unity of action, and whether the Prologue is an integral part of the plan. Turning then to Plautus's improprieties, he deals first with the character of the Parasite, whom he compares with the modern 'Arlequin[1].' With reference to Ergasilus's 'Aetolia haec est,' he ridicules the ancient practice of characters proclaiming who and where they are, and, in support of his view, he quotes Sophocles's *Oedipus* from Brumoy's translation. He also objects to 'asides.' In his criticism of the passages in which Plautus offends against good taste, he takes his stand exclusively on Coste's translation and commentary[2]: while to the detailed time-table which Coste had drawn out to prove Plautus's observance of the unities, he opposes another suggested by Ménage's arguments, or possibly, as I have indicated, by Coste's critics[3].

Lastly, a number of individual passages which do not come under the headings of the regularity of the play or its morals, are dealt with; these are all directly suggested by Coste's translation or notes. One is particularly interesting here as lending further support—if such be necessary—to my argument. It is a question of the translation of Act I, sc. ii, l. 76[4]. Coste, says the critic, reads: '*Heg.* Agesis, rogo. *Er.* Nisi qui meliorem afferet.' As a matter of fact, both editions of Coste read: '*Heg.* Agesis, rogo. *Er.* Emptum: nisi qui meliorem afferet'; and 'emptum' is also translated in the German (that German being clearly influenced by the French translation) which follows! Coste's note on the accepted reading is (pp. 229 f.): 'Tout cela fait un galimathias impénétrable. *Saumaise* s'est apperçu de ce désordre, et a rétabli tout le Passage de la manière que je l'ai fait imprimer. De cette correction il en résulte, ce me semble, un sens fort naturel. Une autre chose qui contribue à justifier la correction de *Saumaise*, c'est que de six Manuscrits de Plaute qu'il y a dans la Bibliothèque du Louvre, l'on trouve *emptum* dans cinq de ces Manuscrits.' It is conceivable that Lessing, had he been the author of the 'Critik,' should have made the slip in quoting Coste's Latin text; but that he

[1] I have not, so far, traced any source for this comparison, which appealed to Lessing so much (see his reply to the 'Critik,' p. 190) that he repeated it in his *Dramaturgie* (St. 18). The critic of the *Histoire critique de la République des Lettres* (see above) raises similar objections to Plautus's employment of the parasite.

[2] Page 148, l. 7—page 150, l. 17.

[3] Cp., for instance, *Histoire critique de la République des Lettres*, XIII, pp. 12 f.: 'Or il semble clair, qu'en accordant même x heures à la durée de toute la Pièce, on ne peut guères donner plus de III heures à ce voyage-là. Pour s'en convaincre, il n'y a qu'à considérer d'abord, que le *second Acte* finit par la résolution d'*Hégion* d'aller expédier ce qui étoit nécessaire pour le départ de *Philocrate*; et que celui-ci est de retour avant que le IV *Acte* commence,' etc. In his second edition Coste changed the numbers in his statement: 'elle ne dure que huit ou neuf heures tout au plus' to 'neuf ou dix.'

[4] Page 161; Limiers, pp. 228 f.

should have been misled by his own slip to write his footnote is quite incredible. The critic's accuracy is again at fault when he says that Coste reads in l. 81 'ictim'; what he does read is 'erem[1].'

How exclusively the critic's emendations of Lessing's translation were based on his French authority will be seen from the following:

Page 162, ll. 12 ff. Coste's translation of the last line of I, ii is: 'Je vais rentrer chez moi, et faire un petit compte pour voir combien il me reste d'argent chez le Banquier. J'irai ensuite chez mon Frère où j'avois résolu d'aller.' And that of the beginning of Act II, sc. ii is: 'Je m'en vais rentrer chez moi, après avoir demandé à mes gens certaines choses dont je souhaite d'être instruit. (*Il parle à ses Valets.*) Où sont donc mes Captifs,' etc.

Page 163, ll. 6 ff. The emendation of Lessing's 'sykophantische Täuschereyen' is merely a translation of Coste's 'Il n'est plus en mon pouvoir de plâtrer mes friponneries.'

Page 163, ll. 24 ff. The text of the French translation is: '*Ar.* ...À quoi bon tous ces signes de tête? *Tyn.* Moi? Je te fais des signes de la tête? Eh Monsieur, à quelles extrémités ne se porteroit-il point, si vous étiez plus loin d'ici! *Hég.* (*commençant à s'appercevoir de la fourberie de Tyndare*). Quoi? que dites-vous? Mais pourtant si j'allois aborder cet insensé?'

Page 164, ll. 20 ff. 'Vae illis virgis' etc. is in the French: 'Pauvres verges qu'on va mettre en pièces sur mon dos, je vous plains!' The criticism of Lessing's retention of 'balista' and 'catapulta' corresponds with Coste's view that they 'n'auroient pas eu la même grâce en François qu'elles peuvent avoir dans l'Original. J'ai laissé les images, et me suis attaché au sens.' And similarly with the other passages criticised.

The quotation from Herr von Effen is from *Le Misanthrope*, Discours LIV: 'Portrait de Plaute.' In *Œuvres diverses de Mr Juste von Effen*, II, Amsterdam, 1742, pp. 104 f.

Who was the author of the 'Critik'? The article itself throws, or professes to throw, a little light on his personality. We learn that 'von Jugend auf' he had 'ein grosses Vergnügen an der dramatischen Kunst gefunden, und wenn mich die Natur einen Dichter hätte lassen gebohren werden, so würde ich vielleicht in keiner andern als dieser Art der Dichtkunst meine Kräfte versucht haben.' Further, that he

[1] In his note he says (p. 231): 'Je préfère *erem* après plusieurs savans Critiques; parce que cette dernière leçon fait un sens plus naturel et plus suivi que les deux autres [*cirim*, *irim*]. Si ce n'est pas la véritable, c'est du moins la plus vraisemblable.'

had always interested himself in declamation, and, by its aid, had developed his naturally weak voice; and that when formerly in Berlin, he had recommended that the recitative in the opera should be spoken and not sung, and 'diese Gedanken fanden damals Beyfall.' Finally, he says that he is by temperament not inclined to be a eulogist[1].

This, however, does not carry us very far, and I have not yet any conjecture to put forward which might help to solve the problem. It is tempting to look to Mylius; but a cursory review of the facts shows that this explanation is not justified. Although he could not have been the author, Mylius may, however, have had something to do with the acceptance and publication of the article. It is unlikely, I think, that Lessing would have, of his own free will, printed this somewhat patronising criticism of himself in place of the 'Abhandlung' he had in preparation; and his comments leave the impression that he did not feel at all comfortable under the attack. Thus the responsibility for the article may have rested with his co-editor; and this may have been the 'verschiedenen allzukühnen und bitteren Beurtheilungen, welche einer von meinen Mitarbeitern einrückte' which, as we have seen, it is otherwise impossible to account for. However this may be, my contention for the present is that, whoever wrote the 'Critik,' it was certainly not Lessing.

The reply which Lessing makes to the 'Critik' is distinctly the best piece of critical writing in the volume; here Lessing begins to emerge as a master of his art. He sums up his opponent's attack on Plautus as concerned with three things: 'Kunst, Witz und Moral'; and he considers these in turn. He begins with the last and takes his stand on the opinion which had been already maintained by Brumoy[2], that an author's morality must be judged by the standard of his own time and contemporaries. Turning to the second point, Lessing shares the abhorrence of the classical critics for the 'Wortspiel'—of Boileau, for instance, and of Gottsched in his *Critische Dichtkunst*—and he exonerates Plautus in the same way as Gottsched had exonerated Virgil for a pun in his *Eclogues*: 'Allein der Poet kann leicht damit entschuldiget werden, dass er sein Räthsel in den Mund eines einfältigen Schäfers leget, der auf dem Dorfe leicht etwas für schön halten konnte, was doch Virgil selbst für was schlechtes hielte[3].' Lessing takes the opportunity of making a warm appeal for that realism in the theatre,

[1] *Schriften*, IV, pp. 132, 134, 135.
[2] 'Discours sur la Comédie grecque' in *Théâtre des Grecs*, III, pp. xxxvi ff.
[3] *Critische Dichtkunst*, 2nd edition (1737), p. 238.

which was coming into favour with the new 'bürgerliche Trauerspiel'; and he appears still more as an advocate of this type of drama when he claims (p. 191) it as a merit that the 'empfindliche Seele' will say with Hegio: 'Was für grossmüthige Seelen! Sie pressen mir Thränen aus.'

Lastly, Lessing deals with the arguments concerning the 'mechanische Einrichtung,' arguments which had been so damaging to his claim for the superlative excellence of the *Captivi*. He calls in Houdart de la Motte's 'unité de l'intérêt[1]' to meet the criticism that Plautus had complicated unnecessarily the action by making Tyndarus a son of Hegio; and to mitigate the sin against the unity of time, he falls back on Coste's own defence[2] that the two places in Aetolia and Elis might be thought of as lying not far from the boundary between the two provinces. Further, he maintains that a certain latitude must be allowed a poet in the matter of the time-unity, especially when he is skilful enough to arrange his plot that the audience do not easily perceive it[3]. From all of which it is clear that Lessing had not yet got very far from the strict classical attitude to the unity of time; that he was still in essential agreement with Corneille. After defending the use of asides on the ground of the greater extent of the Roman stage—an argument set forth by Ménardière—Lessing concludes by once more asserting his thesis 'dass dieses Stück das schönste sey, welches jemals auf das Theater gekommen ist,' the chief reason being that it 'der Absicht der Lustspiele am nächsten kömmt'; but as a subsidiary virtue he claims one which was much under discussion at the time—Voltaire, L. Riccoboni, Calepio, etc.—namely, that Plautus 'die gereinigte Moral, welche durch das ganze Stück herrscht, nicht durch den allzuzärtlichen Affect der Liebe geschwächt hat.'

(*To be concluded.*)

J. G. Robertson.

London.

[1] *Premier Discours sur la Tragédie.* [2] See Limiers, p. 204.
[3] See Hedelin, *La Pratique du Théâtre*, I, p. 234.

EIN UNBEKANNTER BRIEF CHRISTIAN BRENTANOS AN HENRY CRABB ROBINSON[1].

Durch die Schwestern Servière ward Crabb Robinson im Jahre 1801 den Damen Brentano vorgestellt, in deren Haus er bald ein gern gesehener Gast wurde. Ihnen verdankte nach eigener Aussage der damals 26-jährige die Erweckung seines tiefgehenden und bis in den späten Lebensabend hinein bewahrten Interesses an deutscher Dichtung und Literatur, vor allem an Goethe. Hier lernte er auch Clemens, weit intimer freilich Christian Brentano kennen, mit dem er im selben Jahre eine längere Fussreise unternahm, die sie über Göttingen, wo man Clemens besuchte, und durch den Harz nach Sachsen führte. Sie blieben in Grimma, wo Christian damals auf der Fürstenschule studierte und wo Robinson mit Seume[2] bekannt wurde. Nachdem er in dessen Gesellschaft seinen ersten Besuch in Weimar gemacht hatte[3], kehrte Robinson mit Christian Brentano über das Fichtelgebirge, Erlangen und Nürnberg nach Frankfurt zurück. Christian Brentano ging nach Marburg, kann aber nicht gar lang ohne seinen englischen Freund sein. 'While I was at Frankfort,' heisst es in den *Erinnerungen*[4], 'I received an invitation from Christian Brentano'—d. i. zweifelsohne der im folgenden mitgeteilte Brief—'to join him at Marburg.' Robinson folgte der Einladung und lebte 5—6 Wochen mit Christian (und Fr. K. von Savigny) im Hause des Professors der Philosophie Tiedemann. Dann wanderten beide Freunde nach Jena, wo Robinson sich unter dem Prorector Voigt immatrikulieren lässt und bis in den Herbst 1805 verbleibt. Er nennt seine Jenenser Studienjahre 'one of the happiest periods of my life.'

[1] S. Th. Sadler, *Diary, Reminiscences and Correspondence of H. Crabb Robinson*, 3rd ed., 2 vols., London, 1872; G. Herzfeld in Herrig's *Archiv*, CXX, S. 25—34 und CXXI, S. 217—219; Ellen Mayer, *Begegnungen eines Engländers mit Goethe, Deutsche Rundschau*, XXV (1899), S. 172 ff.; J.-M. Carré, in der *Revue Germanique*, VIII, No. 4, pp. 385 ff.; und im *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, XXXIII (1912), S. 3 ff.

[2] Im Briefband auf das Jahr 1804 ist ein Zettel (der untere abgerissene Teil eines Quartblattes) eingeklebt, den Robinson als Autograph Seumes vom Oktober 1804 bezeichnet. Er enthält in fetten, grossen Zügen den Satz: 'You are a lazy body Seume.'

[3] Sadler, I, S. 58—62.

[4] Sadler, I, S. 66.

Unter dem Einfluss des starken Eindrucks, den Christian zunächst auf ihn machte, entwirft Robinson am 22. März 1801 eine recht schmeichelhafte Schilderung von ihm in einem Briefe an seinen Bruder Thomas, worin er Christian eine grössere Zukunft prophezeit als Clemens[1]. Später, als er seine *Erinnerungen* schrieb (begonnen 1843), malt er im Rückblick auf jene Tage ein viel weniger hellfarbiges, der Warheit jedoch näher kommendes Bild von ihm. Die Stelle ist noch nicht gedruckt, mag also hier einen Platz finden: (1801) 'This life of idle enjoyment was put an end to on the 14th of June when I commenced a new career. I set out on a pedestrian journey to Saxony in company with Christian Brentano, the youngest of 5 brothers. He was about 19 or 20 years of age—of a wayward disposition. His heart was good, but his temper was capricious. He was self-willed, had no fixed taste for any art or science and had a great deal of talent which he knew not how to direct to any purpose.....It was no insignificant circumstance, but a frequent source of discomfort that he had a very marked and even ugly expression of countenance. His Italian features had especially a Jewish cast which he denied angrily, though we were often asked, "Sind Sie nicht Hebräer, meine Herrn?" He insisting that it was I not he whose physiognomy brought on us this injurious imputation.'

Der folgende Brief, ein Quartbogen 23,9 cm. hoch, 19,7 cm. breit, ist gewiss nicht der einzige, den Christian an seinen Freund Robinson gerichtet hat, aber er ist, soweit ich sehen kann, der einzige, der erhalten blieb. Crabb Robinson vernichtete in späteren Jahren viele der an ihn gerichteten Briefe; nur was ihn davon wertvoll und merkwürdig dünkte, wollte er erhalten wissen. Die Einladung nach Marburg, der Vorstation für seinen bedeutungsvollen Jenenser Aufenthalt, mochte ihm des Aufbewahrens wert erscheinen; war sie doch zugleich eine Erinnerung an eine Jugendfreundschaft, die freilich im Mannesalter sich lockerte und endlich ganz löste.

Zum Schluss möchte ich noch der Verwaltung der Dr William's library, der Aufbewahrungsstätte des Crabb Robinsonschen Briefnachlasses, meinen wärmsten Dank ausdrücken für das freundliche Entgegenkommen, das mir stets daselbst zu teil wurde.

R. Priebsch.

London.

[1] Vgl. Herzfeld, *Archiv*, cxx, S. 28.

Marburg d. — August 1802.

Ich befinde mich hier recht wohl und habe alles so gefunden wie ich es wünschte. Ein kurtzer Satz, der aber vieles begreifft, was mir schwer werden sollte Ihnen zu beschreiben. Indessen wäre es auch überflussig, denn dass ich Ihnen schreibe, geschieht bloss Sie an unsre Ubereinkunft zu erinnern, und bey'm Wort zu halten. Sie werden also schon alles selbst sehen. Ja ja! lieber Robinson, brechen Sie auf und kommen Sie nach Marburg, wo wir Sie alle sehnlich erwarten. Fehlt es Ihnen an einem Vorwand bey der Madame Kohl[1]? Ey sagen sie ihr nur; sie müsten einem Freunde bey springen, der sich in den letzten Nöthen befände; wie es denn auch wahr ist; denn nach dem ich mich nun in meiner Stube im Hause des Herrn Professor *Tiedemann* ganz eingerichtet habe, sind sie es, was mir zu guter letzt noch nöthig ist. Oder fällt es Ihnen so hart sich von den Mlls. Serv.[2] zu trennen; ist das der Magnet an dem ihr eiserner Muth kleben bleibt? Sitzen Sie dem kleinen häuslichen Glücke im Schoos? und lassen sich mit zärtlicher Hand den Kopf von Sorg und Grillen lausen? Wohlan; was schadet's! Hierher kommen heist ja nicht jenem entsagen. Dieses Gluck bleibt Ihnen gewiss. Es kann ihre Absicht nicht seyn das sichere noch sicherer zu machen; oder zerbrochene Bouteillen zu versieglen. In der Correspondenz ist man tugenhafter (!)[3] das heist besser als im Umgang; dieser Vortheil kann Ihnen von hieraus mit der M. S.[4] zu statten kommen. Täuschen sie sich nicht länger mit ihrer *glüklichen* Lage; wer sich im frühen Morgen erfrischt hat blikt mit Ekel auf andere die noch immer im Bett liegen; so würde Ihnen diese glükliche Lage von hieraus vorkommen. Geben Sie keinem Einwurf gehör der Ihnen noch einfallen möchte, sondern kommen Sie den geraden Weeg hieher; oder wollen Sie einen recht schönen Umweeg machen; so machen sie ihn um Ihre Gewohnheit, Umweege zu machen; Sie kommen dann durch Nachgiebigkeit welches ein schöner Flecken im Rheinherzen ist.

[1] Geboren Mylius, Frau des Frankfurter Doctors Kohl. Crabb Robinson wohnte in ihrem Haus. Mit ihr und ihrem Bruder Mylius machte er am 27. Mai 1801 einen dreitägigen Ausflug nach Wetzlar. Im Briefnachlass befindet sich auch ein Schreiben von ihr an Crabb Robinson nach Jena vom 2. Nov. 1802.

[2] Charlotte und Paulina Servière (vgl. über die Familie Düntzer, *Frauenbilder aus Goethes Jugendzeit*, S. 214). Crabb Robinson lernte sie bald nach seiner Ankunft in Frankfurt, d. i. im Frühjahr 1801, durch den Speirer Domdechant, Baron von Hohenfeld, kennen und schätzen. Im Nachlasse finden sich zahlreiche Briefe Charlottens, die manch interessantes Streiflicht auf Christian, Clemens und Kunigunde Brentano, sowie auf Savigny und August Winkelmann werfen. Ich hoffe bei anderer Gelegenheit darauf zurückzukommen.

[3] 'tugen'—aus einem nicht mehr leserlichen Wort korr.

[4] Charlotte Servière ist gemeint.

Wenn Sie sich länger uber Madame Kohls Schlafkammer aufhalten so werd auch ich mich daruber aufhalten; fort dauernd aber in Marburg bleiben. Wenn Sie was mich betrifft das Schuldige halten; werde ich meiner seits das beste von ihnen halten. Bleiben Sie Ihrem worte treu, und wenn Sie nach Empfang dieses Briefes demzufolge fortfahren, werde ich Ihr Freund bleiben und sonach fortfahren. Diess ist mein Versprechen und glauben Sie dass ich dem nachkomme; wenn sie meiner Bitte nach kommen. Aber wozu die Mühe, was weiteres zu sagen; ich habe ja ihr Wort dass sie kommen wollen; sobald ich Sie von hieraus darum bäte; und da ich weis; wie strenge sie Ihr Wort halten, so erwarte ich sie ruhig.

CHRISTIAN.

Unsre Finanzgeschäfte haben sie während der Zeit nun wohl mit meinem Br. Franz[1] in Richtigkeit gebracht.

(4. Seite, Nachschrift.) Nach dem ich nun meinen Brief noch einmal gelesen habe, missfällt er mir sehr; und ich zweifle ob er Sie bewegen würde hieher zu kommen; leider ist auch die bis der Post abgang noch übrige Zeit zu kurtz, als dass ich noch etwas rührendes hin zusetzen könnte; ich bitte Sie daher als meinen Freund bewegen Sie doch statt meiner den Herrn Robinson dazu; dass er kommt, es ist mir herzlich Ernst darum und ich werde ihnen sehr dafur verbunden seyn. Winkelmann[2] ist hier und wünscht sehr sie zu sehen, kommen sie also schnell, so werden Sie ihn noch treffen, eh er weiter reisst. Kommen Sie, wenn es nicht anders ist, zu erst nur in der absicht eines Besuchs aber ich hoffe Ihr eignes Wohlgefallen wird Sie dann hier halten. Adieu.

[1] Vgl. *Goethe's Briefwechsel mit einem Kinde*, 2. Aufl. (1837), S. 44 f.

[2] August Stephan Winkelmann, geb. 1780 zu Braunschweig, gestorben daselbst als Professor am anatomisch-chirurgischen Kollegium 1806. S. Goedeke, VII, S. 334. Crabb Robinson hatte ihn, den Freund Clemens Brentanos, im Vorjahre (1801) auf seiner Reise mit Christian in Göttingen kennen gelernt. 'He lectured on poetry....The heading of one of his lectures was "the Virgin Mary as the ideal of female beauty and perfection." It was he who first distinctly taught me that the new German philosophy—in connection with which Fichte was the most celebrated living teacher, and Schelling was rising into fame—was idealism' (cf. Sadler, I, p. 48).

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

'Beowulf' and 'Daniel A.'

Since the appearance of Balg's dissertation, *Der Dichter Cædmon und seine Werke* (1882), many scholars have been accustomed to regard the Old English poem, *Daniel*, as a composite, made up of two parts—*Daniel A* and *Daniel B*. Of these, *Daniel A* is probably the older, and an interesting problem arises out of the attempt to determine its chronological relationship to *Beowulf*. In his *Chronologische Studien zur Angelsächsischen Literatur* (1909), Richter came to the conclusion that *Daniel A* is older than *Beowulf*, the argument being based on Morsbach's three tests.

But literary tests are sometimes as reliable as linguistic in determining the priority of one poem over another, and Klaeber in his article, *Die ältere Genesis und der Beowulf* (*Englische Studien*, XLII, 3), has reinforced one at least of Richter's conclusions—the priority of *Genesis A* over *Beowulf*—from another field of research. Klaeber has also made it highly probable that the author of *Beowulf* drew upon *Genesis A* for much of his material. It is the object of the present note to show that there are links between *Beowulf* and *Daniel A*, and that these point in all probability to borrowings on the part of the *Beowulf* author.

It is uncritical to base arguments for borrowing upon the chance occurrence of common terms and expressions, but some weight should be attached to the fact that the use of certain words is confined to *Beowulf* and *Daniel A*, e.g., *beswælan* (*B.* 3041, *D.* 438), *ende-lēan* (*B.* 1692, *D.* 187), *fǣrgryre* (*B.* 174, *D.* 463), *gædeling* (*B.* 2617, *D.* 422), *hreohmōd* (*B.* 2132, *D.* 242), *wǣfre* (*B.* 1150, *D.* 241); cf. Hofer (*Anglia*, XII). The following parallel expressions, though they cannot be regarded as proofs of borrowing (the context is often unlike, and, if borrowing is assumed, *Genesis A* has sometimes to be reckoned with), yet tend to suggest that the style of *Beowulf* is much more in keeping with that of the Christian epic than has usually been supposed.

D. 17 oð þæt hīe wlenco anwōd: *B.* 915 hine fyren onwōd. Cf. *Gen.* 2579.

D. 55 (hæfdon) Israela ēðelweardas
lufan, līfwelan, þenden hīe lēt metod:
B. 1728 hwīlum hē on lufan lǣteð hworfan.

D. 65 Gehlōdon him tō hūðe hordwearda gestrēon: *B.* 124 hūðe hrēmig.

D. 73 ofer ealle lufen (meaning doubtful): *B.* 2886 lufen ālicgean.

D. 85 nales ðy þe hē þæt mōste oððe gemunan wolde,
þæt hē þāra gifena gode þancode:
B. 1270 hwæþre hē gemunde mægenes strenge,
gim-fæste gife, ðe him God sealde. Cf. *Gen.* 2919.

D. 222 freoðo wilnedan: *B.* 188 freoðo wilnian.

D. 230 grim and gealhmōd: *B.* 1277 gīfre ond galg-mōd.

D. 234 in fæðm fȳres līge: *B.* 185 in fȳres fæþm.

D. 418 þæt is wundra sum: *B.* 1607 þæt wæs wundra sum. Cf. *Gen.* 2572.

D. 450 þæt se wǣre his aldre scildig: *B.* 3071 þæt se secg wǣre synnum scildig.

D. 669 swā him ofer eorðan andsaca ne wæs:
B. 1772 þæt ic mē ǣnigne
under swegles begong gesacan ne tealde.

Much more important, however, is the parallelism between passages 180—187, 590—593, and 718—732 in *Daniel* and passages 175—183, 1728—1757, and 980—990 in *Beowulf*.

The idolatry of the Danes is described in much the same terms as that of Nebuchadnezzar and his followers. *Hærg-trafum* (*B.* 175) parallels *herige* (*D.* 181), *gehēton wīg-weorþunga* (*B.* 175–6) = *wurðedon wīhgyld* (*D.* 182) and *metod hīe ne cūþon* (*B.* 180) = *ne wiston wrǣstran rād* (*D.* 182). The *Beowulf* passage refers to devil-worship rather than to a Thor-cult as Sarrazin supposes (cf. Klaeber, *Anglia*, 1911), and is more likely to be an imitation of the *Daniel* passage than *vice versâ*.

The pride-passage (*B.* 1728—1757) is paralleled by a corresponding passage in *Daniel* (590—593), and even helps towards the interpretation of the latter. Hofer and Cosijn were of opinion that the idea expressed by *fyrene fæstan* (*D.* 592) was that of 'becoming fixed in sin.' Blackburn (*Exodus and Daniel*, 1907) rejected this view, on the ground that 'Daniel urges the king to amend his life with the hope of averting the threatened punishment.' But the former view is tenable, since *Daniel*, ll. 590–3, may be regarded as in the nature of a warning—a glimpse into the mysterious ways of Providence—and it should be noticed that Hrōðgar concludes with words suggesting that the purpose of his speech was

the same as Daniel's, cf. ll. 1758–61. The author of *Beowulf* was clearly interested in theological problems (ll. 980—990).

Finally, the scene on the occasion of the inspection of Grendel's arm resembles closely that in Belshazzar's hall, though it is necessary to take the *Beowulf* passage in connection with other passages such as 1647—1650 and perhaps 994—996. The phrase *egeslīc for eorlum* (*D.* 719, *B.* 1649) is common to both poems.

P. G. Thomas.

London.

Chaucer Attributions in MS. R. 3. 19, in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge.

In this manuscript there are a number of notes in a later hand attributing poems to Chaucer, Lydgate, etc. No recent critic has attached much weight to these ascriptions, but some difference of opinion has existed as to whether the notes were made by Stow, who certainly used the manuscript, or whether they were already there and misled Stow, or whether they were added subsequently as a result of Stow's attributions in his edition of Chaucer in 1561. Prof. H. N. MacCracken in his Lydgate Canon (*Minor Poems of Lydgate*, I, xxxix, E.E.T.S., 1910, cvii) writes that 'in MS. Trin. Coll. Camb. R. 3. 19, we find Chaucer's name added by Stow to one piece of courtly poetry after another.' More cautious critics have left the question open. Miss E. P. Hammond in her admirable Chaucer Manual (*Chaucer: a Bibliographical Manual*, 1908, p. 462) says of such a note that 'whether it was written earlier or later than the printing of this and other bits by Stow as Chaucer's is not to be decided.' The notes in question are written by one hand but in a variety of different styles, all very careful, and I have no doubt whatever in my own mind that they were added by Beaupré Bell (cf. e.g., MS. B. 16. 45). Beaupré Bell entered the College in 1722 and the notes must therefore have been made long after the manuscript came to its present home.

A number of other notes in the volume are unmistakeably in the crabbed little hand of John Stow. But in these Chaucer's name only appears twice, once in the margin of fol. 25, where it is not an ascription, but is intended to call attention to a mention of Chaucer in the text, and again on fol. 156, where we find the marginal protest 'Chaucer died 1400' against the date 1448 given in the text of the *Craft of Lovers*. Yet other notes are in a large sprawling hand of the sixteenth century. This on examination proves to be likewise that of Stow. It

ascribes the *Craft of Lovers* to Chaucer, but nothing else. Stow made use of some blank leaves near the end (fols. 236–7) to write in two of Lydgate's fables. They are subscribed 'Finis Iohn Lydgat wryten by Iohn Stow.' The text of these is in his usual hand, the headings in the larger and more sprawling one.

Most of the text of the volume is written in a good hand of the end of the fifteenth century. But fols. 49—53 are in a more current hand. This, however, I believe to be the current hand of the same scribe. Further, fols. 218—252 are in a quite different hand, which Prof. Skeat thought 'considerably later than 1500' (*Chaucer*, VII, lxxiv). But I would call attention to the facts that these last sections are foliated (separately) in the same hand as the rest of the volume, that this hand is pretty certainly fifteenth century, and that the sections were demonstrably not bound in blank. It follows that the contents were written before 1500, and I see nothing in the hand itself to make this unlikely. If I am right, therefore, the *Court of Love* cannot belong to the circle of poets represented by Tottel's Miscellany as Skeat suggested.

The main scribe of the volume is also the main scribe of R. 3. 21, and one of the other hands of R. 3. 21 is said to occur in MSS. Harley 2251 and Addit. 34360 at the British Museum (*Anglia*, XXVIII, 10). Neither is that of John Shirley, but all these MSS. evidently came from a scriptorium where at least one Shirley MS. was in use.

W. W. Greg.

Cambridge.

The Authorship of 'Luminalia,' with Notes on some other Poems of Sir William D'Avenant.

'Luminalia, or the Festivall of Light. Personated in a masque | at Court | By the Queenes Majestie | and her Ladies | On Shrovetuesday Night 1637. | London. | Printed by John Haviland for Thomas Walkley, and | are to be sold at his shop at the flying Horse neere | Yorke House, 1637.' This is the title of the anonymous masque which has been attributed to Ben Jonson (in a pencil note, corrected, on the title-page of one of the British Museum copies); to Robert Greene and Thomas Lodge by Phillips in his *Theatrum Poetarum* (1675), an ascription concerning which Grosart, who reprinted the masque (*Miscellanies of the Fuller Worthies Library*, Vol. 4), remarks that everyone must agree with Dyce that it is most improbable; and finally by R. Brotanek in 'Ein unerkanntes

Werk Sir William Davenants' (*Anglia, Beiblatt*, XI, pp. 177–181) and *Die englischen Maskenspiele* (p. 364), to D'Avenant. Brotanek's assignment rests on resemblances in style between *Luminalia* and *Britannia Triumphans* the King's masque composed for Twelfth Night 1637, of which D'Avenant's authorship was acknowledged; and derives additional support from the probability that the composition of the Queen's masque would also be intrusted to the poet then succeeding, as he had previously supplanted, Ben Jonson in the framing of these exquisite and costly literary ephemera.

The following extract from the Stationers' Hall Register establishes Brotanek's conjecture:

6 March 1657 (i.e. 165$\frac{7}{8}$)

M^{r} Hum: Moseley. Entred for his Copie by vertue of an Assignment under the hand and seale of Thomas Walkley All his Estate right & tytle in the severall Bookes following viz^{t} The Temple of Love a masque at Whitehall on Shrove Tuesday 1634. Brittania Triumphans a masque at Whitehall at Twelth night 1637. Luminalia or the ffestivall Light a masque at Court on Shrove Tuesday night 1637. Salmatida Spolia a masque at Whitehall on Tuesday the 21th of Ianuary 1639. all written by S^{r} Willm Davenant. To w^{ch} Assignm^{t} the hand of M^{r} Thomason warden is Subscribed.

VI d.

The music of *Luminalia* was said, by Rimbault, to have been printed in the quarto. Reyher (*Les Masques Anglais*) remarks that it is not so found in the three British Museum examples; and it is not bound up with the Bodleian copy which I have seen. Rimbault also gives N. Laniere as the composer ('Hist. Introduction to the opera of *Banduca*'); but probably he therein followed Stafford Smith (*Musica Antiqua*, I, p. 60) who by some unlucky confusion has given the words and music of a song in one of Campion's masques (1614) as belonging to *Luminalia*.

Completely 'unknown to bibliographers' is another work of D'Avenant's, entered at the Stationers' Hall in the preceding year.

7 December 1657

M^{r} Henry Herringman. Entred for his Copie (under the hand of M^{r} Thomason warden) a booke called Severall Poems upon severall occasions. To w^{ch} is added A Poem to my Lord Broghill. Epithalamium upon the Marriage of the Lady Mary Daughter to his Highness wth the Lord Viscount ffalconbridge to bee sung in Recitative Musick. An Essay for the New Theatre representing the Preparacõn of the Athenians for the Reception of Phocion after hee had gained a victory. all written by S^{r} William Davenant.

VI d.

There is considerable interest in this edition of poems. Even if the body of the collection possibly consisted of work which previously appeared in *Madagascar and other poems* (1638 and 1648), two, certainly, of the three particularised are poems hitherto unknown. 'My Lord Broghill' is Roger Boyle, first Earl of Orrery, 'the Credit of the Irish nobility for wit and ingenuous parts and a smooth stile both in Prose and Verse,' as Edward Phillips writes. A lengthy address in heroic couplets is inscribed to him in Herringman's posthumous edition of D'Avenant's works. It occurs among 'Poems...never before printed,' but nevertheless may be substantially a reprint of the 1657 poem. There was no reason against its reappearance, such as may have occasioned the suppression of the two others. The *Epithalamium* upon the marriage of Cromwell's daughter Mary is another testimony to the favour enjoyed by D'Avenant under the Protectorate, when also, in Sir Henry Herbert's angry words, 'he obtained leave from Oliver and Richard to vent his operas.' The 'essay for the New Theatre,' representing the reception of Phocion after an Athenian victory, may be plausibly conjectured to have been intended to celebrate Blake's victory at Santa Cruz on April 20, 1657, the same year, possibly for performance on the day (June 3) of public rejoicing, or after his return, had he lived. The 'New Theatre' may intend a reference to the Cockpit, whither D'Avenant's 'public entertainments by moral representations' were transferred from Rutland House; or may resemble a rhetorical flourish on the title-page of Flecknoe's *Love's Dominion* which, he claims, is written for a new reformed theatre for which he implores the favour of Cromwell's daughter, Mrs Claypole.

The accessible catalogues of most of the important public and private collections have been examined for an entry of these 'Severall Poems,' but without result. It is, as has been remarked, unnoted by bibliographers. Possibly, therefore, this entry in the Stationers' Register may afford another instance of books entered but not published, so far as known. Anthony à Wood (*Ath. Oxon.*, III, 808, ed. Bliss) names in his list of D'Avenant's writings, 'Poems on Severall Occasions,' but unfortunately gives no date to establish that he is not referring to the 1672 collection 'never before printed' which forms part of Herringman's folio. Moreover, in his list the preceding and following entries are dated 1669 and 1676 respectively, from which circumstance it is to be feared that he does not intend the 'Severall Poems' of 1657.

It is curious that Masson appears to have known of the *Epithalamium* (*Life of Milton*, Vol. VI, p. 274 note, ed. 1880); but he may equally have

observed the entry in the Stationers' Hall Register. At any rate, he gives no clue to the existence of a copy. Possibly after the Restoration D'Avenant was not overwhelmingly anxious to preserve an edition containing this poetic tribute as well as a triumphal pageant to celebrate the victory of the Protestant commonwealth over the navy of Spain. His literary executors, at any rate, did not print them.

EDITH S. HOOPER.

LONDON.

NOTE ON A LINE IN KEATS'S 'ISABELLA.'

The line, 'The little sweet doth kill much bitterness,' in Stanza xiii of Keats's *Isabella*, does not correspond to anything in the original—the fifth novel of the fourth day of the *Decamerone*. No edition, that I have been able to consult, contains any note on it, and it has, apparently, been taken to be Keats's own addition. But the thought occurs in an Italian device appended by George Turbervile to the seventh of his *Tragical Tales*, a translation of the same story from Boccaccio. In the case of several of his Tales, he introduces devices in Italian, which are not to be found in Boccaccio; and that which he appends to his seventh Tale is,

Un puoco dolce multo amaro appaga

(p. 199 in the 1837, Edinburgh, reprint of the *Tragical Tales*). Turbervile was indebted to Petrarch for this device, the last line of *Triumphus Cupidinis* II ('Era sì pieno'—the second section of the first part of *I Trionfi*) being,

Che poco dolce molto amaro appaga.

Can this be the origin of Keats's line? And if so, can the explanation of the fact that both Keats and Turbervile connect this line from Petrarch with this story from Boccaccio, be that Keats read Turbervile?

Turbervile's *Tragical Tales* were not reprinted until 1837; but three copies of the 1587 edition are known to exist, one being in the Bodleian, the second in the Edinburgh University Library, and the third in the British Museum. The British Museum copy was picked up in 1894 in a secondhand furniture shop in Shrewsbury. It is an interesting coincidence, though probably nothing more, that Shrewsbury was the birthplace of John Hamilton Reynolds, of whose projected collection of stories from Boccaccio, the *Isabella* of Keats was, at one time, meant to form a part. Curiously, too, the two stories from Boccaccio which Reynolds versified, calling them 'The Garden of Florence' and 'The Ladye of Provence' (published in *The Garden of Florence*, 1821, under

the pseudonym of John Hamilton), are translated by Turbervile in his ninth and fourth Tales respectively.

GERTRUDE E. FORD.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN.

'BACKARE,' ETC.

In the last number of the *Review* (Vol. VII, p. 373) Mr Long questions the generally accepted explanation of this word as jocular-Latin for 'back,' 'stand back.' He quotes a passage from Grange's *Golden Aphroditis*, which he thinks 'suggests rather a military signal to retreat, and Italian rather than Latin.' I cannot myself see that the use of the word in this passage in any way differs from its playful use in Udall and other writers.

Mr Long is mistaken in supposing that the passage is 'hitherto uncited.' It was quoted by Steevens in illustration of *The Taming of the Shrew*, II, i, as I find on referring to the Variorum Shakespeare of 1820. In the same note Farmer cites two of Heywood's so-called Epigrams, which furnish the best possible illustration of our word.

(1) Backare, quoth Mortimer to his sow.
Went that sow backe at that biddyng trowe you?

(2) Backare quoth Mortimer to his sow: se
Mortimers sow speakth as good latin as he.

(*Three hundred Epigrammes*, No. 194. Spenser Society's reprint, p. 158.) Heywood evidently regarded the word as 'Latin'; and in his time and Udall's, our literature had not begun to turn to Italian for its conceits and jocularities.

A more serious writer than Heywood may be alleged in support of this view. In 1582 R. Mulcaster[1] has occasion to mention a class of 'Latin words, or of a Latin form, when theie be vsed English like, as *certiorare* [sic] *quandare*.' We can hardly be wrong, I think, in regarding *backare* as a jocular member of this class.

The fashion of using (and coining) words in *-ārĕ* may have been suggested in the first instance by the very familiar Law-Latin *certiorari*. This appears to have been quoted popularly as *certiorare*, and had a protracted vogue in the corrupt forms *siserary*, *sisserara*, etc., especially in the phrase 'with a siserary.'

The word *quandary*, if we are to believe Mulcaster, must have been coined to simulate Latin. Exactly how it came into being, and why it should mean 'a nonplus,' we do not know. Ellis thinks it was for

[1] *First Part of the Elementarie*, c. XVII, p. 111. The passage is given in full by A. J. Ellis, *Early English Pronunciation*, Pt. 3, pp. 912–13.

'*quam dare*, as if they were the first words of a writ' (like *certiorari*). Skeat, less probably, suggests an origin in *quantum dare* 'how much to give.' My conjecture is that some ingenious person chose to regard *quando*, for the nonce, as a verb of the first conjugation, yielding an infinitive *quandare*! This is perhaps temerarious; but it occurred to me on finding the word in close juxtaposition with a genuine Latin vocable of similar sound, in the following passage (*Misogonus* III, i, lines 84, 85, 90, ed. Bond):

Co. An yow knewe as much as I knowe Ime sure youde both laughe and sing youde be in iocundare cum amicis and yow had all toulde.....

Phi. Is this the comforte Ist haue by thy takle thou makst me in a greater quad[ary][1].

In 'iocundare cum amicis' Mr Bond sees a reminiscence of S. Luke xv, 29. However this may be, 'iocundare' is found elsewhere alone. Cf. *Golden Aphroditis*, sig. B ij:

> So *iocundare* leades my will, that wanton needlesse toyle
> Of Courtlike Dames, my pestred wittes *declaro* seekes to foyle.

And Dekker, 2*nd Pt. Honest Whore* (1630), sig. B 2 *verso*:

> I haue no wife, I haue no child, haue no chick, and why should not I be in my Iocundare?

Note that in Dekker, as in *Misogonus*, the phrase is 'in (my) iocundare,' which runs parallel to 'in a quandary.'

Lastly may be cited, again from Grange, what appears to be a specimen, however fantastic, of this 'Latin-like' coinage in *-ārĕ*. It occurs in a duet between a 'Courtyer' and a 'Courtresse,' in anapaestic verse (*Golden Aphroditis*, sig. M iii *verso*). The Courtier sings:

> Let flaunta, galanta, put sorrowes to flight.....

His lady replies:

> Let flanta galanta stiffe holde vp our sayle.....

Then both together, in a concluding rapture:

> With all aflantare then let vs beginne.

Here *fla(u)nta* and *galanta* are apparently connected with *flaunt-a-flaunt* and *galanta-gay* (for instances of which see the *New English Dictionary*). And from *flanta*, with some reminiscence of *aflaunt*, is evolved the phrase *with all aflantare*, which has perhaps more sound than sense to recommend it.

WALTER WORRALL.

OXFORD.

[1] So Bond; Brandl prints 'quand[ary].' The square brackets indicate letters no longer legible, and the termination may have been written *-are*. It rhymes with 'S. Mary.'

REVIEWS.

The Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Edited with Textual and Bibliographical Notes by Ernest Hartley Coleridge. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1912. 2 vols. 8vo. xxvi + 1198 pp.

'The aim and purport of this edition...is to provide the general reader with an authoritative list of the poems and dramas hitherto published, and at the same time to furnish the student with an exhaustive summary of various readings derived from published and unpublished sources.' It also includes 'a considerable number of poems, fragments, metrical experiments, and first drafts of poems now published for the first time.' It may be said at once that Mr Coleridge has carried through his task, a difficult and elaborate one, with an accurate and painstaking scholarship that is deserving of the highest praise, and that as a textual study of the poems his work is not likely to be superseded.

Before the appearance of these volumes we had in Dykes Campbell's Coleridge (1893) what is probably the best existing edition of a modern poet. It was a masterpiece of learned and accurate scholarship, and whilst in its textual variants it gave us all of the matter then available that was of a vital interest, the critical and explanatory notes were of such a full knowledge and fine literary judgment that they are indispensable to the student of Coleridge. The present editor is content with supplying us with a full textual and bibliographical apparatus; in critical and elucidatory comment he enters into no competition with his predecessor.

Of much of this new critical apparatus we may well be impatient. It is true that we can hardly know too much concerning the composition of a really great work of art. To see it growing through its various stages to its final perfection, to watch the poet at work either upon its earliest drafts, or later improving upon its first published form, is itself a valuable study in poetic. But when each trivial change is recorded in the text of verses which were not in the first place worth writing, to say nothing of publishing, the effect is not a little depressing. A poem poor alike in its thought and its expression is only excusable if it has been tossed off in a light moment and then forgotten. A record of correction and emendation causes an awkward feeling that the poet himself took it more seriously than it deserved. It is well perhaps

that we should know this, if it is the truth, for it runs counter to the notion that Coleridge was habitually modest about his poetical achievement; but having gained the general impression, there are few who will care to study the detail upon which it is based. Mr Coleridge's excuse in presenting it is that it is impossible to draw the line between what is likely to be valuable and what is not, but surely one of the chief duties of an editor lies in this discrimination, and the danger of presenting the significant and the insignificant alike, for all the praise it wins from a certain school of modern scholars, is that from the editor it demands diligence and mechanical accuracy rather than nice and critical discrimination, and from the reader it hides the wood in the trees.

On the three greatest of Coleridge's romantic poems no knowledge is given us which Dykes Campbell had not already supplied, but of poems only second in importance to these there are variants of deep interest. That wonderful rejected stanza of 'The Dark Ladie':

> While Fancy like the midnight Torch
> That bends and rises in the wind
> Lit up with wild and broken lights
> The Tumult of her mind—

was not, it is true, unknown before, but it had only been published in 1899, in a rare little volume of facsimile reproduction, and is therefore new to many readers. And from MSS. at Rugby School two valuable drafts are printed of 'The Eolian Harp,' one written before and the other after its publication in 1796. Coleridge was right in regarding 'The Eolian Harp' as the most perfect poem he had yet produced, and no poem is more important to the study of his development both in style and thought. He did well indeed never to print the following variant of the most significant passage in that poem:

> And what if All of animated Life
> Be but as Instruments diversely fram'd
> That tremble into thought, while thro' them breathes
> One infinite and intellectual Breeze,
> And all in different Heights so aptly hung,
> That Murmurs indistinct and Bursts sublime,
> Shrill Discords and most soothing Melodies,
> Harmonious from Creation's vast concent—
> Thus *God* would be the universal Soul,
> Mechaniz'd matter as th' organic harps,
> And each one's Tunes be that, which each calls I.

But we are none the less grateful to his editor for recording it. Bad poetry as it is, if indeed it is poetry at all, it is a valuable commentary upon the passage it elaborates, and it throws light both on Coleridge himself and upon the influence he had in moulding the poetic genius of Wordsworth, and diverting it to the 'philosophic poem.' Of an equal interest are some of the variants supplied to other poems, particularly to Coleridge's last great poem, the address 'To William Wordsworth; composed on the night after his recitation of a poem on the growth of an individual mind.'

Mr Coleridge differs from Dykes Campbell in taking as the basis of his text the 1834 rather than the 1829 edition of the poems. Dykes Campbell was under the impression that the poet had little to do with the edition of 1834, and therefore preferred to follow the earlier text. But Mr Coleridge is undoubtedly right both in the arguments he puts forward in favour of the 1834 text, and in his contention that that text is superior. To the examples which he adduces to prove his point I should like to add one to me even more cogent. Line 6 of the 'Ode to a Departing Year' ran in the first edition 'With inward stillness, *and a bowèd mind.*' This beautiful and imaginative phrase, which Keats borrowed to express his veneration for the memory of Chatterton, was replaced in all editions from 1803 to 1829 by the more obvious 'submitted mind.' But in 1834 the original reading was restored.

This edition has added to the poetical works of Coleridge a large number of hitherto unpublished poems, fragments and metrical experiments. Seeing that these verses were in existence, it was necessary, we suppose, to print them: we can only regret that they existed. The priceless possession of Coleridge's true poetry was already overweighted with much heavy and wearisome lumber, and those who most love the one will most deeply lament the increase of the other.

There is nothing in these poems and fragments that is of the least value. But with the metrical experiments the case is different. They are not indeed great poetry, but they are of a real and vital interest to the student of metre. They strengthen our sense of Coleridge's superb mastery of a varied rhythm and cadence and at the same time our conviction that no poet of a genius comparable with his, has left so little that is worthy of him.

The volumes are completed with a full Bibliography of the Poetical Works, which is a model of its kind, and will prove of the highest value. Mr Coleridge is to be warmly congratulated upon the result of his labours, and the more so if their conclusion has set him free to complete his life of the poet, which has been long and eagerly awaited.

E. DE SÉLINCOURT.

BIRMINGHAM.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. III. Collected by W. P. KER. Oxford: University Press. 1912. 8vo. 152 pp.

The third volume of papers published by Members of the English Association compares favourably in variety and value with the earlier volumes. Its best is probably better and its worst possibly worse.

In the first paper Professor Gilbert Murray suggests with clearly provocative intent 'what English poetry may learn from Greek.' His analysis of the essential qualities of classical art is clear, humorous, sane and illuminating. We disagree with some of his *obiter dicta*: for instance, 'that poetry excels prose threefold and fourfold in sheer boring

power.' Which of us could wade through a prose *Endymion* or a prose *Faerie Queene*; or, to take an extreme instance, how could even the voracious readers of the early nineteenth century have read, still less admired, Southey's *Kehama* in prose? The truth is that the normal English reader gets far more stimulus from the possibly rough and inartistic *form* of English poetry than is given to the Professor of Greek, whose ear and taste have been trained in the severer school of the ancient Greek poets. The latter half of the paper deals with 'texture' in Greek and English poetry, and here Professor Murray reveals himself unblushingly as a partisan. He exemplifies the English hexameter by a few of the worst lines in Clough's *Bothie*, quotes for praise some of Kipling's *Mandalay*, because its four-syllabled feet accomplish a Greek metrical effect, and finally—the most unkindest cut of all—quotes for dispraise as 'one of the most admired lyrics' of Milton's *Samson Agonistes*,

> God of our fathers, what is man?
> That thou towards him with a hand so various,
> Or might I say contrarious...

It is, alas! possible that this actually is one of the most *admired* of Milton's choruses, but the critic should in fairness have illustrated not from the most admired but from the most admirable. He does full justice however to the style of *Paradise Lost*, and his whole discussion of metrical texture is enlivening and suggestive. But we must protest against a conception of style which denies the existence of English lyrical poetry before Shelley mastered the secrets of Greek technique. Against the statements (1) that 'Elizabethan song cannot handle the trisyllabic foot,' (2) that 'No Elizabethan song can handle what the Greeks call syncope' we would quote (1) from a famous song of Ben Jonson's,

> Have you seen but a bright lily grow...

(2) from a song of Nashe's which should be famous,

> Brightness fa-alls from the air,
> Queens have di-ied young and fair

(printing in Mr Murray's manner). No one is better able than Mr Murray to reveal the essentials of Greek art, and if his criticism of English poetry is biassed it is also sharply stimulating.

Mr Mackail's paper on *The Lover's Complaint*, a poem which has hitherto eluded the attention of scholars, is a serious contribution to Shakspearean criticism. The present critic submits it to a close examination under three heads, vocabulary, syntax and phrasing, with the result that its essentially un-Shakspearean style is revealed. A careful logical argument then leads to the hypothesis that the author of the poem is the unknown rival poet of the Sonnets. Fuller evidence is needed, as Mr Mackail points out, to support this conjecture, but the paper as it stands is a model essay in scholarship.

Professor Saintsbury suggests the value of his lecture on 'Dante and the Grand Style' in his own statement (p. 115) that 'when I have to

write about an author I generally read him first.' To read is for this critic to live through his author, to strike out new thought, and above all heartily to admire. In this way he leads his hearers to re-read Dante. His best contribution to the somewhat overdone discussion of 'The Grand Style' is his vindication of the conceit as a possible element. 'The Grand Style,' he insists, 'can confer its *grandeeship* on any expression to which it gives its hand to kiss or its garment to touch.'

Mr T. S. Omond contributes an essay on 'Arnold and Homer,' in which we could wish he had devoted less space to the general question of methods of translating Homer, and more to the particular question of rendering in English the metrical equivalent of the hexameter. It is Mr Omond's distinction among English Metrists that despite his learning and his enthusiasm he manages to keep his head. He puts concisely the central truth about English attempts at classical metres in two sentences, 'The right way of handling English verse must be gathered from observing the practice of English poets when writing from native inspiration,' and 'Development will come, if at all, on lines already familiar: syllable-quantity will be "counterpointed" to accent, remaining ancillary and subordinate, as in all our native verse.'

Canon Beeching in his essay on 'Blake's religious lyrics' draws an interesting parallel between the doctrines of Blake and St Paul, and touches certain aspects of the poetry with good sense and feeling. But he remains on the outskirts of Blake's philosophy. No one who has plunged whole-heartedly into Blake's thought could make the unqualified statement (p. 150) 'that when he began to generalize, whether in science or art or religion, he fell into error.'

Mr D. W. Rannie treats a fine subject laboriously and unfruitfully in his paper on 'Keats's Epithets.' The most simple of readers will hardly need to be told that 'Tiger-passion'd is short for "with such passions as those of a tiger,"' and the least passionate will cry out at the statement that 'in the great lyric of *Endymion* mushrooms are called *cold*, to express abstinence in contradistinction to vinous indulgence.' Again, when he asserts that 'Keats makes us feel (see *Hyperion* I. 74 and 353) that the stars are *always* earnest and patient just as they are always bright,' we must protest that Keats could never on a point of natural observation make us feel anything so false. But the critic himself is at any rate always earnest and patient, and his researches will probably suggest to those who already know Keats new depths in his meaning and new life in his images.

HELEN DARBISHIRE.

OXFORD.

Le poème Anglo-Saxon de Beowulf. Par HUBERT PIERQUIN. Paris: Alphonse Picard. 1912. Demy 8vo. iv + 846 pp.

The title of this book, its massive proportions, the high reputation of its publishers, and the distinguished quality of recent French scholarship in the field of English literature, all combine to excite pleasurable

anticipations. We may say at once that these anticipations are not realised. The Introduction to the *Beowulf* is quite inadequate, occupying a bare twenty pages, with a liberal allowance of blank spaces. It is quite uncritical, containing good and bad taken indifferently from remote and from somewhat modern writers. Thus we are informed that 'la langue de Beowulf est une variété primitive du dialecte saxon de l'ouest, à laquelle sont mêlées, çà et là, des expressions normandes.' By 'saxon de l'ouest,' as we learn from a statement on p. 738, M. Pierquin means the language of Wessex; by 'normandes,' of course, he means Norse. To the Introduction there succeeds, unexpectedly, and as it were absent-mindedly, a treatise of three hundred and fifty pages entitled 'Les Saxons en Angleterre,' in the preparation of which, M. Pierquin tells us in an unobtrusive footnote, he has followed Kemble's *Saxons in England*. 'Followed' is hardly the right word. Journeying through, or rather over, this tract we at last reach the text of Beowulf, printed in short lines side by side with a translation in French prose, and with footnotes relating to the MS. readings and emendations by previous editors.

Next come ten pages of explanatory notes, we merely remark the curious fact that these notes stop short at about l. 700, with no explanation of the deficiency. Then follows the text of *Widsith* and *The Battle of Finnsburh* with translation and footnotes; an index of proper names; a bibliography going no further than the year 1907 and omitting many important works, and an appendix with woodcuts representing weapons, ornaments, houses, ships, etc. Next we come to a treatise of nearly sixty pages on 'Rythmique Anglo-Saxonne et du très-ancien Anglais,' and one of forty-eight pages on the elements of Old English grammar, followed by a grammatical bibliography lifted bodily out of the third edition of Sievers' *Angelsächsische Grammatik*. Last of all, the prodigal but now flagging M. Pierquin presents us with a 'Lexique' or word-list to *Beowulf* covering fifty pages.

We feel now constrained to ask ourselves what was M. Pierquin's object in compiling such a book. He tells us in the preface that his sole aim is 'populariser un grand poème national dont les origines sont aussi fièrement revendiquées par l'Angleterre, que celles du *Roland* par la France.' Further, he says, that his labour will not have been in vain if the reader 'a compris notre effort vers la vérité.' The book therefore is apparently intended by its compiler to be popular and at the same time scientific. Let us examine it from this standpoint. M. Pierquin frankly admits that the various treatises in this volume are compiled from the works of a few earlier writers. They certainly give a good deal of information, but the treatment is uncritical, nor is it up-to-date, a defect which runs through the book. The treatise on Old English versification is very detailed in its account of verse-types, but there are notable omissions, and no account is given of the relative stress of the various grammatical classes of words. The outline of West-Saxon grammar is fairly correct, so far as it goes, but while too succinct and technical for the general reader, it is of no use to the student

who has Sievers' Grammar on his bookshelf. The 'Lexique' to *Beowulf* is a mere word-list, with many words omitted. The meanings are given first in English, which is odd, and then in French, and one reference only in each case is added, followed by 'etc.' This is likely to be a disappointment to the French reader who wishes to make some acquaintance with the language of the poem.

We have reserved the text of *Beowulf* and the French prose version to the last for consideration. Here it is that we have a real test of M. Pierquin's scholarship, of his knowledge of Old English, in a word of his fitness for the work he has undertaken. The text certainly presents an exceptional number of new features, in the shape of misprints which occur with incredible frequency, and are by no means always due to the printer. Instead of the usual symbols þ and ð, we generally find *th* used. But now and again we come across *p* and *d*, which are tell-tale survivals of the process adopted by M. Pierquin in the making of his text. Stops are inserted or omitted at random, so are the hyphens of compounds. Prefixes thus set at liberty have in quite a number of cases deserted to the preceding word, so that linguistic monsters appear, which will sorely puzzle the readers for whom M. Pierquin has provided the glossary and manuals of the language. The text seems to be based on those of the older editors, modern authorities such as Klaeber, Holthausen, Schücking, etc., being ignored. But it is the French prose version which is the least satisfactory part of M. Pierquin's performance. To substantiate this statement we append a few of the choicer specimens culled from the first seven hundred lines, which will, we trust, dispense us from specifying errors in other parts of the book. In l. 27 *felahror* is 'tout caduc'; l. 32 *hringedstefna* is 'à la proue sonore' (!); l. 70 *æfre gefrunon* is 'célébreraient à jamais'; l. 226 *sæwudu sældon, syrcan hrysedon* is 'ils rangèrent leurs rames, laissèrent leurs cottes de mailles'; l. 231 *beran ofer bolcan* is 'suspendre aux mâts'; l. 258 *se yldesta* is 'le plus hautain'; l. 312 *hildedeor* is 'le guetteur au cheval de guerre'; l. 330 *irenþreat* is 'faisceau hérissé d'airain'; l. 333 *fætte scyldas* is 'boucliers épais' (!); l. 434 *for his wonhydum* is 'grâce à sa peau maudite' (!); l. 440 *þær gelyfan sceal* is 'c'est là que dormira'; l. 489 *on sæl meoto* is 'mange avec joie' (!).

This list could be greatly extended, but we refrain. M. Pierquin would have done better if he had given a literal translation of one of the German or English versions of the poem. Indeed, we may say in general that M. Pierquin has missed an opportunity. If he had only taken the trouble to do his compiling with average carefulness and discernment he could have produced a book which would have been a real boon to those French students, now not a few, who are interested in Germanic origins and literatures.

W. J. Sedgefield.

Manchester.

Keble's Lectures on Poetry, 1832—1841. Translated by Edward Kershaw Francis. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1912. 8vo. 434, 534 pp.

It need not be doubted that Keble's *Prælectiones Academicæ* have been less widely read than they ought to be, or that this has been partly owing to the fact that they are written in Latin. It is not likely indeed that any except those who have some classical scholarship would be attracted by them, nor indeed could any others read them very profitably: but after all a Latin book is less easy to read than an English one, and requires more time; so that we are naturally disposed to welcome this translation, though we cannot without loss lay aside in favour of it the graceful and beautiful Latin of the original.

It may be said at once that the version is a good one, easy and idiomatic for the most part and not too much suggesting the idea of a translation. There are lapses, it is true. Thus 'they are more habituated to daily avocations in the full light of publicity' cannot be regarded as an ideal rendering of the simple 'ut qui in luce oculisque multorum magis sint versati' (I, p. 36), 'somewhat unelastic' is hardly a good rendering for 'præfractiori' (I, p. 41), and 'much, not to say a great deal' will never do for 'multa, ne dicam plura' (II, p. 232). In the following sentence, 'I hardly know whether it is justifiable to associate with such important considerations as these, the exquisite clearness of Lucretius' style, which like a clear atmosphere, makes all his theories stand out in such clear sequence and proportion' (II, p. 366), there is an awkward repetition of the words 'clear' and 'clearness' which (it is almost needless to say) is not found in the original, 'exquisitum illum styli Lucretiani nitorem, quo velut puro aere pellucet rationum junctura et series,' and after all 'clearness' does not exactly represent 'nitorem.' There is a similar or rather worse instance of the same kind in the very next sentence, 'since its peculiar power consists less in illuminating particular passages than in its power of filling the whole' etc. But these occasional infelicities are balanced by many examples of peculiarly happy renderings—'soothe deep-rooted and vital yearning' (I, p. 90), '[she] will wistfully gaze back on the well-known charms which have delighted her from her birth' (p. 92), 'we must trace by what special impulse, by what unrest (quo desiderio) he was led to draw together, as by a magician's wand, all the undiscovered resources of poetry' (p. 93),—these are examples gathered within a few pages, and it would be easy to find many more, while the general style is such as the author might well have approved, if a translation had been executed in his life-time, as was apparently at one time intended.

Yet, while noting and appreciating the merits of his work, we feel bound to say that the translator, in planning it, has made one very serious mistake. The lectures are concerned with the Greek and Latin classical poets, and they are naturally full of quotation. The argument

is everywhere illustrated, and the criticism justified, by passages from Homer, Æschylus, Pindar, Lucretius or Virgil, and these passages are here in almost every case represented by English metrical translations. The originals are not given even in footnotes. Now it is obviously impossible that critical remarks upon poetry can be properly illustrated by translated quotations, and even where it is the substance and not the style of the passage that is referred to, the badness, for the most part, of these particular versions goes far to destroy the reader's pleasure, so that it may fairly be said that without constant reference to the *Prælectiones* or to the original authors from whom the quotations are taken, no real satisfaction is to be got from these volumes. The lectures on the *Iliad* are made almost intolerable by the combination of Chapman and Pope to which we are treated: it is difficult to say which represents Homer worse. In those on the *Odyssey* for the most part we have Cowper, who is far less irritating, because at least he reproduces with simplicity the sense of the original. For Virgil we have to put up with Dryden, and Lucretius we see for the most part through the medium of Creech. A particular protest must be made against Chapman, who is often grotesquely bad; but in fact the whole thing is a mistake: the original passages ought of course to stand in the text, and if translations are thought to be needed, they should be in prose[1]. Numberless examples might be quoted of the ruinous effect produced by the system adopted. Keble compares Virgil, *Æn.* VIII, 407 ff., with Homer, *Il.* XII, 432 ff., and the former passage is represented by Dryden's version, the latter by Chapman's (I, p. 185). Between the two it may fairly be said that all the points that are relevant to the comparison have been dropped out. Again, the author points out how Lucretius in a certain passage (II, 629 ff.) appeals to common sympathies by a reference to childhood and the games of children, but the passage as quoted from Creech has no such reference and contains nothing that corresponds to the words 'pueri circum puerum' (II, p. 320). Sometimes the translation is inconsistent with Keble's interpretation of the passage, as in II, p. 183; more often, of course, it merely fails to illustrate in any degree the lecturer's remarks about the features of style in the original. For example, Keble quotes Lucretius, III, 1060 ff., and asks his reader to note especially the restrained simplicity of the passage. But what Mr Francis gives us is not Lucretius but Creech, and in his version there is no restrained simplicity. The translator found Lucretius too simple for his taste, and he took good care that there should be a sufficiency of ornament added (II, p. 352). In quoting the well-known passage about the horse from *Iliad*, VI, 506 ff., Keble remarks upon the appropriateness of the broken rhythm in the line,

ῥίμφα δ᾽ γοῦνα φέρει μετά τ᾽ ἤθεα καὶ νομὸν ἵππων.

[1] We have noticed a very few cases in which this is done. A quotation from Virgil is once given in the original, with the prose translation by Conington (I, p. 77); and in another place a few lines from Lucretius are cited in Latin, with Munro's translation (II, p. 309).

But in the translation, as given from Pope, all is smooth enough,

> And springs exulting to his fields again (I, p. 168).

Again, in one place we are asked to note the sound of the verse in a passage from Pindar, and are presented with Moore's rendering of it, — fairly good, but of course not in the least reproducing the sound. In a few cases, no doubt, the versions are successful and serve their purpose. Some of Cowper's from the *Odyssey* are, for translations, all that can be desired, e.g. I, p. 290,

> Shout not, be still. Unholy is the voice
> Of loud thanksgiving over slaughtered men.

Dryden occasionally contributes a fine rendering, as in the passage quoted in I, p. 460, and a few jewels from Conington are scattered here and there. On the whole, however, this large collection of examples serves chiefly to remind us of the general rule that poetry cannot be translated.

Other matters are of less importance; but it would have been well to distinguish the footnotes of the translator in some way from those of the author, and the method adopted sometimes of rendering an echo of some Latin poet by a quotation of a somewhat similar tendency from an English poet, is rather misleading. When we find (I, p. 92) 'the "cool, sequestered vale of life,"' we naturally think that Keble quoted from Gray. It is only when we turn to the original that we perceive his expression to have been a reminiscence of the 'fallentis semita vitæ' of Horace. Again, the quotation from Mr Mallock's poem which appears on II, p. 365 surely ought not to have been introduced into the text.

This is not the place to say much of the lectures themselves, but I am unwilling to pass them by without a few words of appreciation, and I gladly make use of the translation provided by Mr Francis to illustrate what has to be said. The lectures are remarkable first for their theory of poetry generally, then for their classification of poets as primary and secondary, and finally for the critical judgment shown in dealing with the poetical work of those whom the author selects as preeminent. It is not (as has sometimes been stated) by the criterion of pleasure that he appraises poetry, but by its function of healing. 'De Poeticæ Vi Medica' are the words on the title-page of the *Prælectiones* which indicate their subject. Poetry is 'a kind of medicine divinely bestowed upon men: which gives healing relief to secret mental emotion, yet without detriment to modest reserve: and, while giving scope to enthusiasm, yet rules it with order and due control' (I, p. 22). It is interesting to note the relation of this view of poetry to the Aristotelian doctrine of *καθαρσις* as applied to tragedy, though Keble himself perhaps did not fully appreciate the relation, for he probably did not take the *κάθαρσις* of the *Poetics* in a medical sense. Indeed it is noticeable that Keble finds some difficulty in bringing the more objective forms of poetry, the Epic and the Drama, under the terms of his theory

(I, p. 86), which seems to have been framed first with a view to lyric poetry, perhaps more particularly with a view to the work of the poet to whom he dedicated these lectures, and whom he repeatedly refers to as the greatest of his time, namely Wordsworth. How can Epic poetry or Tragedy be regarded as an outlet of individual emotion, a remedy for the unrest of a passionate spirit? The answer is given in the distinction of ἦθος and πάθος, and the twofold division of poetry in accordance with this distinction. There are those whose poetical expression serves to calm the tumult of momentary passion, in themselves and in others, those who compose 'at a white heat' as Shelley expresses it, though they may afterwards add laborious finish; but there are also poets in whom some life-long yearning, some deep-seated unrest can satisfy itself only by tasks of a different kind, by presentation of human life and destiny in forms which correspond to the feeling which disturbs them, a feeling which is not indeed tumultuous but none the less powerful and compelling. Thus Homer was moved by an intense yearning for those heroic times which when his poems were composed had passed or were rapidly passing away; Æschylus was disturbed by his overpowering sense of the working of a Supreme Power, combined with his doubts as to the divine righteousness; Euripides was moved by his deep sense of common humanity; Lucretius by his passion for mystery and infinity; Virgil by his longing for the peace and simplicity of country life. In a certain sense, then, all poets are lyrical (II, p. 93). And the distinction of primary and secondary poets is made upon the basis of the same principle. Those are primary who are dominated by a single, sincere and consistent feeling. 'The central point of our theory is that the essence of all poetry is to be found, not in high-wrought subtlety of thought, nor in pointed cleverness of phrase, but in the depth of the heart and the most sacred feelings of the men who write' (II, p. 201). It is because there seems to the lecturer to be no such genuine spring of inspiration visible in the work of Sophocles, that he places him in the second rank, as one who has become a poet in virtue of consummate skill and culture. Keble holds that he has a want of true religious feeling and of pity. He is conscious that by such a case as this his theory is tested severely, but he holds that he must not shrink from the test, and on similar grounds he excludes Horace also from primary rank. Whatever may be our opinion about these cases, we must all agree that the theory is to some extent insufficient, that some further test than that of consistency and sincerity is required: yet we must allow that as expounded and illustrated by Keble, it is extremely interesting and suggestive. And here we come to the detailed criticism of particular works, to which the greater number of the lectures are devoted. Nothing can be better than the fine appreciation of the character of Achilles in the *Iliad*, or the charming estimate of the story of the *Odyssey*. With Æschylus the lecturer is in deep religious sympathy, and his discussion of the *Prometheus Vinctus* and of the *Oresteia* is profoundly illuminating. His defence

of Euripides as the champion and protector of common human feeling, no woman-hater, but something of an ascetic, with a special love of religious purity, as shown in the characters of Ion and Hippolytus, is one of the most interesting things in the lectures; and his treatment of Lucretius is distinguished by true poetical appreciation, triumphantly prevailing over his natural aversion to the religious theories which it is the chief aim of Lucretius to drive home. In spite of these, he finds in him a constant testimony to the highest and purest ideals, and a feeling for the mystery and infinity of Nature, by which, all unknown to himself, the poet wonderfully supports and communicates to those who read him the religious sense which in terms he seeks to abolish. 'Infinita contemplari, religio quædam.' Finally in Virgil, perhaps the dearest to him of all the Classical poets, he finds not primarily the Epic poet[1], but the lover of the calm tranquillity of Nature, delighted ever to recognise the vestiges of a power higher than human, and rightly recognised by the Middle Ages as a true precursor of Christianity.

The lectures are concerned entirely with Classical literature, but they have very numerous references to the English poets, and especially to Shakespeare and Spenser. Keble repeatedly speaks of Wordsworth as the greatest poet of his own time, but he highly praises Scott, for whom he evidently has a genuine affection. Byron is mentioned with sufficient acknowledgment of his poetical power, but with reprobation of the tendency of his work; while Shelley, who to some extent comes under the same condemnation, is recognised as a poet of finer feeling and higher powers of rhythmical expression. We feel that if Keble had known him better, he might have been saved in company with Lucretius. Neither Coleridge nor Keats is mentioned. To Burns there are several references, and he is evidently a favourite, though the inequality of his work is deplored. Milton is four or five times referred to, and *Lycidas* is particularly appreciated. But Keble thought it beneath the dignity of his Chair to quote modern poets in modern languages, and when he has occasion to cite passages, he turns them into Greek or Latin[2], thus lending some colour, it must be admitted, to the practice of Mr Francis, who quotes the Greek and Latin poets in English. But Keble's quotations from the English poets are rather ornamental than necessary to the argument; and moreover the translations are made, and very exquisitely made, for the occasion by the author himself. They increase in fact the sense that we have throughout, of

[1] Some parts of Keble's criticism of the *Æneid* are amusing in their severity, as for example his remarks on the character of Æneas, and his observation that the plea of God's command is 'the customary cloak of fraud throughout the *Æneid*.' He makes the very true remark that Virgil's men and women move our sympathies not so much for their own sakes as on account of their fates and fortunes, while Homer's characters 'are so hit off that each of them exhibits characteristic and peculiar individuality' (II, p. 383).

[2] Thus Burns is quoted in Greek elegiacs (*Prælect.*, p. 20) and in a Latin lyric metre (p. 238), Milton's Sonnet on his blindness in Greek iambics (p. 243), *Paradise Lost* in Latin hexameters (p. 226) and Spenser's *Astrophel* in Latin sapphics (p. 523). Rather strangely, the quotations from the Bible are given in Greek, not in Latin.

being in contact with a very attractive personality and one of true poetical taste and feeling; and in spite of the faults to which we have referred, we heartily welcome the present translation, which is certain at least to make the circle of contact wider.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

Poems of Adam Lindsay Gordon. Edited by Frank Maldon Robb. Oxford: H. Frowde. 1912. 8vo. cxxiv + 390 pp.

The irritating brevity of human life is never brought home to us with greater force than when some new and promising development of science or literature or art seems to open before our eyes, and we know that the historian of the future will alone be able to appreciate it at its proper value, or see whither it is tending. Such a development is what we may roughly term 'Colonial Poetry,' which has a quality of its own, difficult to define but quite distinct from our own modern lyrics. The pioneers who go out to hew a path for civilization, to ranch and mine and build, are usually men of action rather than of culture, but contact with the forces of Nature stirs the poetry which lies buried in the heart of most of us, and the lumber-man and the squatter understand, perhaps better than their brethren in the Old World, the feeling that inspired the song of pre-Conquest Wanderer or Seafarer. Theirs is a hard life enough, but though it may be brutal it is never vulgar, and not even the rise of occasional big cities has as yet been able to reduce it to the conventionality to which we are accustomed, or to rob it of the reality which a spice of physical danger always implies.

> No game was ever yet worth a rap
> For a rational man to play,
> Into which no accident, no mishap
> Could possibly find its way,

is not poetry, but its frank enjoyment of adventure is akin to the spirit which has inspired some of the most poetic ages of history. The Elizabethans too were mighty men of their hands, pioneers and explorers and it is curious and interesting that in their poetry, as in that of their Anglo-Saxon forbears, we find the same mixture of exhilaration and bitter depression that marks the poems of the greatest lyric poet of Australia. Gordon's physical delight in anything daring has inspired some of his finest passages. The ride in *The Romance of Britomarte*, though it echoes Browning a little too obviously, is full of vigour and life, *The Roll of the Kettledrum* has in it something of the thrill of battle as *Hippodramia* has the thrill of the race-course. It is a pity that a touch of Byronic sentimentality so often spoils the effect. Gordon is more at home among horses than among men. He has not the reticence and restraint needed for dramatic effect, and when he does not, as is too often the case, intrude his own personal emotion, he is apt to expatiate upon the sentiments of his characters. Mr Robb, in his interesting

prefatory essay on Gordon's debt to English literature, quotes with approval the statement that *Fauconshawe* 'breathes the very spirit of the knightly days of chivalry'; but while the picturesque side of chivalry, and still more the sentimental side, make a strong appeal to the poet, he has none of that power of grim suggestion, none of that dramatic simplicity, which give their fascination to the genuine ballads. The Launcelot of *The Rhyme of Joyous Garde* is Tennysonian, but not in the least mediæval; his self-torturing is far more closely akin to that of 'a second-rate sensitive mind' than to the splendid and dignified tragedy of the *Morte d'Arthur*. Where Gordon excels is, as has been said, in his description of rapid action and in his occasional happiness of phrase. Mr Robb draws attention to his constant, and often most effective use of alliteration and assonance. The influence of Swinburne and Tennyson is marked, but it is easy to gather passages which are no mere imitation of other men's tricks of style:

> And the long lithe sword in the hand became
> As a leaping light, as a falling flame,
> As a fire through the flax that hasted,

is neither Swinburne nor Tennyson, but Adam Lindsay Gordon. It is a pity that the poet who could write like this, too often allowed his facility for rhyming to carry him off into mere jingle. Mr Robb likens him to Browning in this respect, and it is easy enough to pick out certain superficial resemblances, but Browning's verse at its ugliest is hewn out of the man himself; Gordon catches now an echo of this poet, now a hint from that, and plays with styles as if he were a boy experimenting. And of the deeper influence of Browning—in spite of Mr Robb's contention to the contrary—it is hard to find a trace. The tragedy of Gordon's short life left its mark on all that he wrote. At the best he has but a weaker version of Henley's stern self-reliance to offer us:

> So we'll ne'er surrender tamely
> To the ills that throng us fast.
> If we must die, let's die gamely;
> Luck may take a turn at last.

At other times bitterness overwhelms all else:

> A little season of love and laughter,
> Of light and life and pleasure and pain,
> And a horror of outer darkness after,
> And dust returneth to dust again.
> Then the lesser life shall be as the greater
> And the lover of life shall join the hater,
> And the one thing cometh sooner or later,
> And no one knoweth loss or gain.

This is very different from the gospel of *Prospice* or *Abt Vogler*. But with all its faults and immaturities the poems of Gordon have a quality of their own. Whether that quality is Australian or peculiar to the poet himself, it is as yet too early to say. In either case it ensures

their continued existence. Gordon is not a great poet, but he is a poet, and we owe a debt of gratitude to the sympathetic and careful editorship of Mr Robb, who has given us the opportunity of studying his life and works side by side, and of judging dispassionately his place in the roll of nineteenth century writers.

GRACE E. HADOW.

CIRENCESTER.

Die neuere deutsche Lyrik. Von PHILIPP WITKOP. Erster Band: Von Friedrich von Spee bis Hölderlin. Zweiter Band: Novalis bis Liliencron. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1910, 1913. 8vo. viii + 366, vii + 380 pp.

Witkop is a disciple of Wilhelm Dilthey; he seeks to combine poetry, aesthetics and philosophy. He takes the personality of the poet as his starting-point: 'die Lyrik gibt uns einsam und unmittelbar den Dichter, das Individuum.' His task is, 'die innere Form der lyrischen Persönlichkeit darzustellen: eben sie ist die Form ihrer Lyrik.' The touchstone of good lyric poetry is inner truth, and he tests this by asking if the context is based on 'Erlebnis.' With the Minnesang he has little sympathy: it lacks 'Leidenschaftlichkeit, Notwendigkeit'; even Walther von der Vogelweide is no exception (p. 39). The Volkslied is 'typisch' in contrast to 'individuell,' its importance has been exaggerated. He regards it as exclusively 'Bauernlied' (p. 44) and the Kirchenlied as 'Lied der Geistlichen' (p. 47). The 'Schäferpoesie' of the seventeenth century is simply 'verlogen' (p. 50). No poet before Spee 'hat sich zum unmittelbaren, notwendigen Ausdruck der Persönlichkeit durchgerungen' (p. 35). The mere literary historian, at whom Witkop arrogantly scoffs, would hardly make such statements. We grow tired of Witkop's formulas and schemes, especially when they convey no meaning, e.g., 'Hagedorn, der von der Sinnlichkeit zur Idee verlangt,' or 'Angelus Silesius hat der deutschen Lyrik den Innenmenschen gegeben, Brockes den Sinnenmenschen.' The stress laid on 'Erlebnis' brings us to the amusing conclusion that Hagedorn is greater than the Anacreontists because he really suffered from gout and died an early death (p. 141). The chapters on Claudius, Bürger and Schubart are good. Witkop's view of Goethe's many love affairs as a necessity of his 'Hingabe an das Allgemeine' (p. 252), of his dramatic characters as purely subjective (p. 248), the explanation of his unrhymed stanzas as 'herrlichste Notwendigkeit' (p. 250), and of the sensual tone of the *Römische Elegien* also as a 'Notwendigkeit'—'sein in sich selber ruhender, reiner Geist verlangt seinen Gegenpol, die reine Sinnlichkeit'—are examples of the dangers of formalism and narrowness.

In the second volume some more 'Schlagwörter' are introduced, 'Erdverwachsenheit,' 'Volksverbundenheit' and 'Weltverbundenheit.' Heine has none of these qualities, 'Je wurzelloser Heine in der Welt

des Wirklichen war, ohne Land, Volk und Beruf.' So his early poetry is discarded, although Witkop in the first volume insisted principally, almost solely, upon the lyric being 'persönlich, individuell.' Heine's use of the form of the Volkslied is unjustifiable, 'ein Versuch Volkslieder ohne Volksverbundenheit zu dichten' (p. 202). His poems do not possess 'den schlichten Ton des Volkslieds' (p. 201), a statement contradicted later on page 322. The *Nordseebilder* 'entbehren jeder Reinheit und Wahrheit: Heine hat ein inneres Verhältnis zur Natur nie besessen' (p. 204). The treatment of Eichendorff, Hebbel and Droste is good, but Storm seems rather neglected (5 pages to 32 for Platen). Lenau's merits are distinctly underestimated: his poems are 'einzeln und für sich meist unvollkommen und wenig selbständig' (p. 137). Liliencron is fully discussed, but it is strange that he is praised for his use of the 'Feile' (p. 345), which in Heine's case was regarded as a proof of 'innere Unwahrheit' (p. 204). Witkop confines himself to the great names, but in a book of 764 pages room might have been found for Freiligrath, Herwegh, Geibel, Lingg, Heyse, Groth. There is no attempt to trace literary connections or to show how the poetry breathes the spirit and atmosphere of the age. The greatest fault of the book is the want of a broad, clear view of the essence of poetry. Certainly 'Erlebnis' and inner truth are very important, but to insist on these to the neglect of external form, of the imaginative working-up of the theme, which frequently, as in Mörike's case, means the addition of a large fictional element, inevitably leads to false judgments. Witkop's book has been written gradually; that may explain the lack of clearness and consistency, but not the pomposity and bombast. In his preface he discards the 'Nur-geschichtliche, das Zufällige' and yet—one example only—he gives us an indescribably dreary paragraph enumerating all the public offices held by Eichendorff (p. 80).

JOHN LEES.

ABERDEEN.

An Introduction to the French Classical Drama. By ELEANOR F. JOURDAIN. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1912. 8vo. 208 pp.

Les critiques anglais ont bien souvent répété, depuis Dryden, que le théâtre classique français était froid, compassé, artificiel, trop chargé de rhétorique. Ç'a été, de tous temps, et partout, l'avis de beaucoup de collégiens en France, et il s'y rencontre même des amateurs de littérature qui ne se soucient pas, leurs études finies, de reprendre contact avec les chefs-d'œuvre qui leur ont été imposés dans les programmes du baccalauréat et de la licence ès lettres; ils les admirent de loin et laissent à d'autres de les pratiquer et de les goûter; c'est pour eux-mêmes plaisir acheté trop cher. Miss Jourdain s'est attachée à vaincre dans le public anglais des préventions ou des résistances du même genre; son désir serait de convaincre les étudiants des Universités où nous enseignons:

'That the French classical drama of the seventeenth century has been influential because it is not cold, but thrilling with passion, because the words are not mere rhetoric, but carry the right meaning, because the setting is not a sign of artificiality, but of art. The real antithesis may be not, as has been supposed, between the naturalism of the present day and the conventionalism of the seventeenth century, but between the subjectivity of the Teutonic idea, with its accompanying love of mystery and expansiveness, and the French social ideal, whether expressed by Corneille and Racine in different forms of romanticism, or by Molière in those of realism' (p. 7).

Miss Jourdain ne traite en effet que de ces trois auteurs, qu'elle connaît bien; elle fait peu d'allusions aux écrivains du second ordre, ou même à celles des œuvres qui, aujourd'hui oubliées, ont triomphé à la scène et nous permettent de reconstituer à distance, aujourd'hui, en ses principaux traits, le sens esthétique du public moyen d'alors, qu'elles ont pleinement satisfait. L'auteur s'est défendu d'avance contre ce reproche possible: 'This introductory essay does not attempt to do more than suggest lines of investigation and reading, and therefore the illustrations given are not exhaustive' (p. 8–9).

Le livre est ainsi divisé: généralités sur le théâtre du XVII^e^ siècle (définition des termes des différents genres, de la loi de 'l'action dramatique, telle que l'a donnée Brunetière, la volonté en action,' volonté individuelle et volonté collective—celle-ci plus marquée chez Racine que chez Corneille,—l'interprétation et la mise en scène); Corneille et la scène française, Corneille et le drame espagnol, Corneille et la théorie du drame; Molière et la scène française et italienne, Molière de *l'Ecole des Maris* au *Misanthrope*, la Comédie de Molière; Racine et le drame grec, Racine et les forces dramatiques qui, à l'arrière-plan, dominent ses tragédies (rapprochement avec Maeterlinck), Racine et la poésie dramatique; en appendice, deux courtes notes sur Corneille et son interprétation des textes d'Aristote, et sur les adaptations de pièces françaises classiques en Allemagne.

L'auteur a fort bien fait de ne pas donner l'analyse des pièces dont il avait à parler (il ne s'occupe avec quelque détail que du *Cid* et de *Polyeucte*), et de réduire au minimum, comme il l'a fait, les indications biographiques; il était plus important d'essayer de définir l'originalité des trois grands écrivains dramatiques par rapport à leurs modèles de Grèce, de Rome, d'Italie ou d'Espagne; et les lecteurs anglais trouveront les rapprochements faits avec le théâtre anglais des XVI^e^ et XVII^e^ siècles, plus instructifs que ceux qui auraient pu être faits avec des œuvres françaises de moindre valeur.

Cette 'mise au point pour le public de langue anglaise' ne vise point à l'originalité; elle n'en sera pas moins utile; elle témoigne d'intelligence, de finesse, de sensibilité esthétique; elle a recours directement aux textes et aux documents du temps aussi bien qu'aux jugements des critiques modernes. Parmi ceux-ci Miss Jourdain cite de préférence L. Moland, Rigal, P. Stapfer et H. Bergson (*Le Rire*) pour Molière, Le Bidois et Paul Janet pour Racine, Jules

Lemaître pour Corneille, plus rarement Brunetière, G. Lanson et É. Faguet, nulle part G. Larroumet pour Molière, G. Michaut pour Racine, ni Paul Desjardins (*La méthode des classiques français*).

Le développement n'a rien de didactique, de sec, ni même de fermement rigoureux dans le détail de l'ordonnance; la rédaction est sobre, aisée, agréable et distinguée. La révision typographique semble n'avoir pas été faite avec toute la minutie désirable. Voici quelques contributions à l'Errata futur: p. 14, note 5, 3e vers faux; supprimer *a*; p. 18, note, dern. ligne, lire *des libertés*; p. 19, n. 2, 5e ligne de bas en haut, lire *aux dépens*; p. 26, dernier vers cité, lire *M'explique son oracle*; p. 28, n. 1, l. 4, lire *ancienne* dignité; l. 5, lire *seroys*; p. 29, n. 1, l. 7, lire *fût*; p. 43, n. 1, l. 2, lire *dis*; p. 44, n. 2, vers 8, lire *fais*, vers 9, lire *toi seul as*; p. 48, n. 1, ligne 2, lire *finie*; p. 61, n. 2, l. 4, lire *s'appropriait*; p. 87, n. 1, l. 3, lire *latin*; p. 89, l. 5, lire *attribuerois*, l. 6, lire *fût*; p. 91, l. 3, lire *malaisés*, n. 7, lire *leurs*; p. 92, l. 16, lire *employer*; p. 93, l. 3, lire *derniers*; p. 107, n. 1, l. 2, un mot omis après *avait*; p. 155, vers 2, lire *s'opposeront* (le vers tel quel est faux); p. 157, 4e vers cité, faux, par omission d'un mot; p. 158, n. 3, dern. vers, lire *va t'en*; p. 167, 2e vers cité, lire *enchaînés*; p. 175, n. 3, dern. vers fautif; p. 179, vers 1, lire *préparoit*; p. 181, n. 4, 2e vers fautif; p. 188, n. 2, l. 2, lire *stratégique*; p. 199, l. 4, lire *malgré*; les formes en *oit* seraient à restituer en certains endroits; p. 51, notes, p. 91, l. 5, p. 95, l. 3, p. 119, n. 2, p. 120, 2 derniers vers, p. 126, n. 2, p. 138, n. 1, p. 139, n. 1, p. 142, 10e vers cité, p. 149, 3e ligne citée, p. 151, 4e vers cité.

L'index tient lieu de table bibliographique, et la Préface, de conclusion générale.

H. Chatelain.

Birmingham.

The Commedia dell' Arte; a Study in Italian Popular Comedy. By Winifred Smith. (*Studies in English and Comparative Literature.*) New York: Columbia University Press, 1912. 8vo. xv + 289 pp.

A dispassionate estimate of the importance of the *Commedia dell'arte* is not easy to give. Even its origins are still somewhat obscure; while its influence on foreign comic plays and on later Italian ones has received a varying amount of recognition. Much has been written on the subject, and some particular departments have been exhaustively investigated, but no one can claim to have given a thoroughly comprehensive and synthetic survey of the whole. Miss Smith was certainly well advised in directing her attention to the *Commedia dell' arte* and she has taken considerable trouble to attain completeness and at the same time to satisfy the requirements of modern criticism. The results of her labours, in so far as novelty is concerned, are somewhat scanty, but he would be an unfair critic who did not appreciate the usefulness

of some sidelights she has brought to bear on the subject. After all, a book in which the main facts are summarised, current opinions carefully criticised, and the most important data conveniently grouped, cannot fail to act as a stimulant to further research. The treatment of a subject involving several countries and covering well over two hundred years offers many difficulties. Points which have been thoroughly thrashed out had to be reconsidered, or the work would have been incomplete, while others requiring further research could not in the general economy of the book be adequately enlarged upon. Such difficulties, which we cannot say have been fully overcome, account for the main shortcomings of this work. There is however one really pleasing feature of this book; it draws attention to certain accounts of performances of *commedie dell' arte* which were written by foreign visitors in Italy, such as Coryate. For these interesting sources, which had not hitherto been thoroughly exploited, we are greatly in the author's debt.

The daring, if fascinating, opinion which was last upheld by De Amicis, about the connection of the *Commedia dell' arte* with the popular theatre of Rome, has been now entirely abandoned. The pages devoted to this discussion might consequently have been curtailed without any appreciable harm, although Miss Smith had necessarily to make her attitude on the matter clear. The author is duly impressed by the fact, only too often overlooked, of the continuity of Latin thought throughout the Middle Ages in Italy; but she rightly sees that, however absurd it may be to trace the origin of the professional extemporary comedians to the Roman popular actors or the like, it would be equally uncritical to ignore that analogous conditions may in the same people have the same effects even at an enormous interval of time. The people of Rome, before they were mastered by the fatal obsession of the *ludi circenses*, were far more partial to the *Mimi* and the *Atellanae* than to the higher sort of theatricals, which a refined minority, brought up on Greek culture, had striven to acclimatise. However little we know about those less noble performances, we know enough to realise that they were closely allied to the coarse antics of *joculatores*, *cantimbanchi* and others of the same class. This is the sole justification for the erroneous assumption of a real continuity of the genre. When churchmen thundered against theatrical performances as schools of immorality, they had a much easier victory over the offshoots of the artificial Græco-Roman theatre than against the more popular forms of entertainment, and throughout the Middle Ages we repeatedly find sermons aimed at the scandals caused by farces and jugglers.

Histrionic types may have existed before the *Commedia dell' arte*, but even although typical masks were proved to have existed before the middle of the sixteenth century, this would in no way prove that the *commedia* itself had come into being at so early a date. The author is rather too ready to dismiss the *Rappresentazioni sacre* as witnesses to the popular taste for comic scenes. D'Ancona himself (why does

Miss Smith always print Ancona for D'Ancona?) quotes several good instances of comic scenes and comic characters which were imitated by professional players. The *Rappresentazioni* were in time acted by professional players, a circumstance which should not be overlooked, since it was only necessary for these or the patrons for whom they played to light upon the idea of adapting a *commedia erudita* to the coarser taste of the people, by introducing comic features, topical allusions, or even some favourite mountebank, in order to have a *commedia dell'arte*. The external history of the earlier professional comedies in Italy is carefully studied, and is drawn, as we already mentioned, from contemporary sources; but the account might have been rendered more complete by a closer acquaintance with critical studies on this subject[1]. Miss Smith had, however, a wide field to cover and could hardly be expected to deal exhaustively with every section of it. On the history of the earliest companies she cannot be said to have thrown any new light[2].

Naturally Miss Smith has given great attention to the collections of *scenari* and has carefully analysed some of these[3], but it is to her credit that she has not been led, by partiality for the subject, to overrate the importance of the *commedie dell' arte*, either as works of art or as sources of later developments in Italy or in other countries. In fact, if anything, she seems inclined to be apologetic for the theme of her study. She avers quite rightly that the authors and performers of these plays never aimed at anything but the immediate entertainment of a rather unsophisticated public. But perhaps it is difficult to do justice now to these plays, merely by reading the *scenari*; their value and popularity must have depended to a great extent on the histrionic powers of the actors. They were meant to give scope to the acting and to the improvisation of professionals who must have had in many cases quite remarkable gifts developed by a specialised training, which ought not to be overlooked or underrated. We must realise that the *scenario* gives us only the background of the picture, the foreground was held by the actor, who enhanced the value of a meagre plot by clever acting and judicious extemporising. Otherwise the long-continued popularity of these plays would be inexplicable.

[1] We may mention here that the bibliography reveals in general many omissions. It might be rendered more complete by a reference to the notes to *La Commedia* by Ireneo Sanesi, in *Storia dei Generi letterari*, Milano, Vallardi, 1911. There is an interesting article, *Notizie sulla storia del teatro a Padova nel secolo xvi*, etc., in the *Ateneo Veneto*, xxii, vol. i.

[2] A couple of articles which might have been mentioned are *Le abbazie degli stolti in Piemonte*, by F. Neri in the *Giornale Storico*, xl (1892), and *Alcuni appunti sul teatro in Piemonte nel secolo xv*, by F. Gabotto in the *Biblioteca delle Scuole Italiane*, v. There is also a curious passage in Lasca which I venture to draw attention to, not knowing whether it has already been noticed, '...facendosi per sorte allora una commedia nel palagio de' Pitti dalla compagnia del Lauro e Amerigo...' (Lasca, Cena i, Novella ii, Torino, Pomba, 1853, p. 291).

[3] The following might be added to the collections which are mentioned: *Ancora una raccolta di scenari*, by F. de Simone Brouwer, in *Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, Serie v, x, 11—12.

The problem which Miss Smith also deals with, as to why Italians practically held the privilege of performing these plays, does not seem very important, and we are inclined to think that a satisfactory solution is not to be found. Goldoni's attitude towards the *Commedia dell' arte* is rather more complex than the author assumes (p. 207); he was not an opponent of it, he merely disliked bad and debased *commedie*, as is explained at great length in a recent book[1].

Had Italian actors never crossed the Alps the interest in their performances would be limited. They appear, however, to have found their way to all parts of civilised Europe. Miss Smith has spared no pains in estimating the importance of such performances in different countries. Her treatment of this part, though brief, is full of interest. Spain might still be searched to some advantage for documents regarding this matter. Germany does not offer much, but France and England stand out with quite a wealth of documents. Miss Smith has attained so large a measure of success in her study that it appears almost pedantic to point out deficiencies[2]. Perhaps it would have been more profitable if she had limited the field of her study and tilled the soil more deeply. There is however little doubt that her book is the result of serious study, that it offers a useful comprehensive survey of an interesting subject, and that it will be read with profit even by those who are already conversant with some sections of the history of the *Commedia dell' arte*.

Cesare Foligno.

Oxford.

Dante and the Mystics. By Edmund G. Gardner. London: Dent. 1913. 8vo. xv + 357 pp.

This book will be welcome to all who love Dante or who are interested in the mystical theology of the thirteenth century. Mr Gardner adopts the fruitful method of interpreting the poet by showing what were the sources from which he drew, and he brings to the task not merely scholarship and learning but also, what is yet more important, sympathetic understanding and spiritual insight.

Under the literal sense of the *Commedia* lies the allegorical or mystical sense. Dante's journey is no mere imaginary voyage through some remote heaven and hell, but the unfolding of intense present experience. Heaven *is* 'fulfilled desire,' Hell *is* 'the shadow of a soul

[1] *Goldoni e la Commedia dell' arte*, by Q. Marchini-Capasso, Napoli, Perrella, 1912. Little information is to be obtained from *Études de Littérature Italienne*, by Maurice Mignon, Paris, Hachette, 1912, pp. 115—153. *La comicità e l' ilarità del Goldoni*, by A. Momigliano in the *Giornale Storico*, lxi (1913), pp. 193 ff. does not deal with this subject.

[2] Considering the wide scope of the bibliography the following might have been added. *Early Plays from the Italian*, by R. W. Bond, Oxford, 1911; *La comédie italienne en France*, 1570—1791, by N. M. Bernardin. I have also noticed a few misprints: p. 7, n. 3 'Piangiani' for 'Pianigiani'; p. 151 'Gonzaghe' for 'Gonzaga'; p. 157, n. 40 'Aridosio' for 'Aridosia'; p. 160, n. 47 'extravagently'; p. 203, note 'della piu infime' for 'della più infima'; p. 272 '(Pellizzaro) anteriora' for 'anteriore.'

on fire.' Dante himself has been there. He bears witness to what he has seen and known and felt. Hence the precious poem is the most intense biography of spiritual experience. The perception of the hideousness of vice and the beauty of virtue is a moral vision and implies the apprehension of an unseen reality and the appeal to an eternal standard. This intuition may light the soul in growing clearness through all the grades of spiritual ascent.

In the Epistle to Can Grande Dante claims that he has himself had the mystical and ineffable experience described in the closing cantos of the *Paradiso*, and refers in support of his claim to Richard of S. Victor's *de Contemplatione*, to S. Bernard's *de Consideratione* and to S. Augustine's *de Quantitate Animae*. Professor Lubin of Graz pointed out Dante's dependence on these sources, though he used Richard's *Benjamin Minor* rather than the *Benjamin Major* as the basis of comparison, and he also remarked that this evidence of indebtedness is a valuable confirmation of the genuineness of the Epistle in which these writers are appealed to. Dante was a scholastic in theology but a mystic in religion, and his debt to the mystics has been hardly enough realized. Mr Gardner takes these writers and tracks out minutely correspondences of thought and phrase between them and the poem.

Dante is so many-sided that almost every aspect of the life and thought of the time is reflected in his writings. Mr Gardner thus correlates the mystical side of his teaching with that of the writers whom he studied and brings it out clearly against the backgound of the age.

This method is a most valuable one, but there is danger if it is too exclusively followed. The poet is treated as though he were a literary man working in a well-stocked library and having unlimited leisure, yet during many of these years he was an almost destitute wandering scholar, devoid of luggage and pressed by 'rei familiaris angustia.' Thus much of what finds expression in the poem probably comes from life rather than from books, and from living tradition rather than from study. When Mr Gardner is dealing with Dante's account of S. Francis, for instance, as he tracks the poet's phrases back to some written source, the whole story seems to become a mosaic of tesselated fragments collected from the various lives of the Saint and the *Sacrum Commercium*. Yet much of Dante's knowledge of S. Francis must have come from intimate companionship with the friars. Among them the history of S. Francis was cherished and sacred and the memory of the Saint was present and powerful.

Again Mr Gardner is inclined to minimize the influence of S. Bonaventura. Here was a great and fervid personality whose life overlapped that of Dante, who had walked over the hills of Umbria and who had left the fragrance of his footsteps where the exiled poet was wearily to tread. Signor di Bologna has shown how innumerable are the correspondences between the thoughts of that great mystical teacher and the *Commedia*. Although in many cases these thoughts can be

traced back to earlier sources and follow an age-long mystical tradition, yet we may well believe that what would otherwise have been mere diffused light was concentrated in S. Bonaventura and through him as a glass focussed in burning radiance on the soul of Dante.

Once more Mr Gardner would find a literary origin for many of the details of the Earthly Paradise in the visions and writings of Mechteld of Magdeburg and of Mechteld of Hackeborn. Yet surely it is more probable that the imagery is drawn from some scene which the poet had visited. Is it rash to hazard the suggestion that Dante's description of the Earthly Paradise was based on the life at the monastery of La Verna in the Casentino? It was here that S. Francis received the Stigmata. At this monastery S. Bonaventura wrote, in 1259, the *Itinerarium Mentis in Deum*. Dante knew the neighbourhood well (*Infer.* 29^{109}, 30^{65}, 30^{73}, *Purg.* 5^{94}, 14^{43}, *Canzone* XI, *Ep.* ii, tit.). It was perched high up by the crest of a spur of the Apennines. Here the air was clear and cool, and in the forest close at hand the sweet breeze moved whisperingly through the tremulous leaves. Here the birds, the little sisters dear to S. Francis, sang joyous and undisturbed. Here hyacinth, anemone and narcissus carpeted the ground. This Franciscan retreat was indeed the summit of a mountain climbed by penitence, discipline and love. Here man's pristine innocence was restored and his happiness regained. Here he was crowned and mitred king and priest over himself. From this favoured ground the pageant of the Church's chequered progress through history might be clearly seen. Here his early ideal confronts Dante again, and he thinks of Beatrice now ascended from flesh to spirit and become more resplendent than before in beauty and virtue. Through her he is cleansed and strengthened and becomes ready to ascend to the stars. It is surely from some such experience as this rather than from books that Dante paints the Earthly Paradise. His imagery is necessarily borrowed from the shows of time, but he uses it to express experience which is beyond time and transcends space. The mystic is not he who makes known for the first time some divine secret, but he who has gained a standpoint above the temporal and who enjoys a new and direct vision of old truths. Dante ascended through every sphere till he reached the final ineffable experience so complete, so satisfying, which transcended thought and escaped memory. From the patron's stairs to the heavenly ladder, from the salt bread of dependence to the bread of angels, from poverty and pain and exile to the light and love and joy of the Empyrean the way was open and Dante passed along it. The glory which he beheld was no will of the wisp, but that sure light which had guided the saints shining ever more and more to the perfect day.

Dante tells us that his vision was similar to that which had illumined them. He partakes of a great inheritance and is related to the masters of the religious life. That relationship is very close, and in studying it Mr Gardner is a penetrating and sympathetic guide.

JOHN T. MITCHELL.

WAVERTREE.

MINOR NOTICE.

Rather more than seven years ago (to be exact, in August, 1906) Professor J. Schick of Munich proposed the publication of a great *Corpus Hamleticum*, a collection of volumes which should contain everything of importance in the literatures of the world bearing on *Hamlet*. Thanks to Professor Schick himself the first volume of this mighty undertaking is now before us—(*Corpus Hamleticum: Hamlet in Sage und Dichtung, Kunst und Musik*, herausgegeben von J. Schick. I. Abteilung, *Sagengeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. I. Band, *Das Glückskind mit dem Todesbrief, Orientalische Fassungen*: E. Felber, Berlin, 1912). Having thus fixed his attention on one element in the Hamlet-story, Dr Schick employs his unrivalled linguistic powers to survey the whole field of the world's literature, and to select for his first volume a number of oriental versions of the saga. Some are here printed in Oriental languages and characters—Pali, Sanskrit, Turkish, Coptic and Ethiopian—all accompanied with translations and critical comments in German; others are discussed and put into their places, but not printed in full. Only an orientalist—perhaps one should say, a syndicate of orientalists—could profess to deal with the book on its merits. But a student of English may be permitted to express his admiration of that enthusiastic devotion to Shakespeare which has led Dr Schick to undertake a work which needed extraordinary courage as well as extraordinary attainments, and no less his appreciation of those earlier pages of the book in which the editor surveys his field and in particular compares the treatment which the 'Death-missive' saga receives at the hands of Saxo Grammaticus and at those of Shakespeare. From the eloquence and brilliance of these passages one is justified in expecting much from the future volumes of the series. 'The succeeding volume,' we are told, 'will have to investigate the migration of the saga across Europe: Greek, Albanian, Roumanian, Hungarian, even Croatian, Russian, Polish and Finnish versions will demand our attention, as well as numbers of versions in Romance and Germanic lands.' It is clear that the monument which is being raised to Shakespeare will be no less a monument to the powers of the man who conceived the design and is carrying it into execution.

G. C. M. S.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

June—August, 1913.

GENERAL.

Cazamian, L., Études de psychologie littéraire. Paris, Payot. 3 fr. 50.

Johnston, H., Phonetic Spelling: a proposed universal alphabet for the rendering of English, French, German, and all other forms of speech. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Prys, J., Der Staatsroman des 16. und 17. Jahrh. und sein Erziehungsideal. Würzburg, Staudenraus. 4 M.

Verrall, A. W., Collected Literary Essays, classical and modern. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

General.

Allard, E., Friedrich der Grosse in der Literatur Frankreichs, mit einem Ausblick auf Italien und Spanien. (Beiträge zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen, vii.) Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

Bibliotheca Romanica. 177. La Vida de Lazarillo de Tormes. 178. U. Foscolo, Opere. Poesie giovanili. Poesie liriche e satiriche. Originali. 179—182. D. Diderot, Le Paradoxe sur le comédien. Le neveu de Rameau. 183—187. M. Alemán, Guzmán de Alfarache, i. 188—189. P. de Ronsard. Oeuvres. Odes, i. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. Each no., 40 pf.

Italian.

Antologia d' antichi scrittori senesi, dalle origini a S. Caterina, a cura di F. Tozzi. Siena, Giuntini e Bentivoglio. 3 L.

Antologia della lirica veneziana: raccolta di poesie dialettali dal cinquecento ai nostri giorni, ordinate da A. Pilot. Venice, G. Fuga. 5 L. 50.

Balbo, C., Sommario della Storia d' Italia, a cura di F. Nicolini, i. (Scrittori d' Italia, l.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Baretti, G., Scelta di lettere familiari, critiche e descrittive, a cura di L. Piccioni. Livorno, Giusti. 1 L. 60.

Bellezza, P., Curiosità dantesche. Milan, Hoepli. 8 L. 50.

Carducci, G., Opere complete, vol. ix, x. Bologna, Zanichelli. Each 2 L. 50.

Casini, J., Scritti danteschi. Florence, Ist. Micrografico italiano. 4 L. 50.

Chiappelli, A., Storia del teatro in Pistoia, dalle origini alla fine del sec. xviii. Florence, B. Seeber. 6 L.

Dalla Man, L., Un discepolo di P. Aretino, Lorenzo Venier. Ravenna, Tip. Nazionale. 3 L.

Dante, A., Pages choisies, traduction, résumés et commentaires par A. Valentin. Paris, A. Colin. 3 fr. 50.

Fantoni, G., Poesie, a cura di G. Lazzeri. (Scrittori d' Italia, xlviii.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Fiammazzo, A., Note dantesche sparse. Savona, D. Bertolotto. 5 L.

Lambert, F. A., Dante's Matelda und Beatrice. Eine Skizze. Munich, Piloty und Loehle. 6 M.

Liguori, E., and A. Pelli, Dizionario carducciano. Florence, G. Barbèra. 4 L.

Marino, G. B., Poesie varie, a cura di B. Croce. (Scrittori d' Italia, li.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Mignon, M., Étude de littérature italienne. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti al Senato, a cura di A. Segarizzi, ii. (Scrittori d' Italia, xlix.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Stampa, G., and V. Franco, Rime, a cura di A. Salza. (Scrittori d' Italia, lii.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Vossler, K., La Divina Commedia, studiata nella sua genesi ed interpretata. Trad. di S. Jacini, vol. ii, i. Bari, Laterza. 4 L.

Spanish.

Cejador y Frauca, J., Tesoro de la lengua castellana. Origen y vida del lenguaje. iv. Madrid, Perlado. 12 pes.

Fabo, P., Rufino José Cuervo y la lengua castellana. 3 Tomos. Bogota, Arboleda y Valencia. 22 pes. 50.

Ruiz, J., Arcipreste de Hita, Libro de Buen Amor. Edición y notas de J. Cejador y Frauca. (Clasicos Castellanos, xvii.) Madrid, 'La Lectura.'

San Juan de la Cruz, Obras del mistico doctor. Edición crítica. Tomo ii. Toledo, Pelaez. 5 pes.

Santillana, Marqués de, Canciones y Decires. Edición y notas de V. Garcia de Diego. (Clasicos Castellanos, xviii.) Madrid, 'La Lectura.'

Savj-Lopez, P., Cervantes. Naples, Ricciardi. 3 L.

Wurzbach, W. von, Einführung in die romanischen Klassiker. 2. Cervantes, Don Quijote; 3, 4. Cervantes, Novellen. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. Each no., 1 M. 50.

French.

(*a*) *General (incl. Linguistic).*

Bruneau, Ch., Étude phonétique des patois d'Ardenne. Paris, E. Champion. 15 fr.

Fleischer, F., Studien zur Sprachgeographie der Gascogne. (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, Beihefte, xliv.) Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M.

Guillaume, F. G., Études de grammaire française logique. Le lieu du mode dans le temps, dans l'espace. Fasc. 2. Paris, Fischbacher. 4 fr.

Martinon, Ph., Comment on prononce le français. Paris, Larousse. 5 fr.

Passy, P., Les sons du français. Nouv. édit. Paris, H. Didier. 2 fr.

Schönig, R., Romanisches vorkonsonantisches L in den heutigen französischen Mundarten. (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, Beihefte, xlv.) Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M. 60.

(*b*) *Old French.*

Kristian von Troyes, Yvain (der Löwenritter). Textausgabe mit Einleitung, herausg. von W. Foerster. (Romanische Bibliothek.) Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M.

Olschki, L., Paris nach den altfranzösischen nationalen Epen. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 10 M.

Yderroman, Der altfranzösische, herausg. von H. Gelzer. (Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, xi. Jahrg. 1. Band.) Halle, Niemeyer. 16 M.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

Balzac, H. de, Œuvres complètes. Tome xi, xii. Paris, L. Conard. Each 9 fr.

Bersaucourt, A. de, Études et recherches. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Bithell, J., Life and writings of M. Maeterlinck. London, W. Scott. 1*s.* net.

Borgerhoff, J. L., Le théâtre anglais à Paris sous la Restauration. Paris, Hachette. 5 fr.

Chateaubriand, Correspondance générale, introduction, notes et tables par L. Thomas. Tome iii. Paris, E. Champion, 10 fr.

Clerget, F., Villiers de l'Isle-Adam. (La Vie anecdotique et pittoresque des grands écrivains.) Paris, L. Michaud. 2 fr. 25.

Estrée, P. d', Le théâtre sous la Terreur. Paris, Émile-Paul. 7 fr. 50.

Lommatzsch, E., Gautier de Coincy als Satiriker. Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M.

Marcel, L., Le frère de Diderot, Didier-Pierre Diderot. Paris, E. Champion. 3 fr. 50.

Méra, G., L'esthétique de Chateaubriand, genèse et développement. Paris, Libr. des Saints-Pères. 50 c.

Michaut, G., Anatole France, étude psychologique. Paris, Fontemoing. 3 fr. 50.

Michaelis, P., Philosophie und Dichtung bei E. Renan. (Romanische Studien, xiii.) Berlin, E. Ebering. 4 M.

Rabelais, F., Œuvres. Tome ii. Édition critique publ. par A. Lefranc, J. Boulenger, H. Clouzot. Paris, E. Champion. 10 fr.

Strowski, V., Histoire du sentiment religieux en France au xvii^{e} siècle. Pascal et son temps. iii^{e} partie. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 3 fr. 50.

Verlaine, P., Œuvres posthumes. Tome ii. Paris, A. Messein. 6 fr.

Vigny, A. de, Œuvres complètes, éd. définitive. 9 vols. Paris, Ch. Delagrave. Each vol. 3 fr. 50.

Voltaire, Œuvres inédites. Tome i. Mélanges historiques, publ. par F. Caussy. Paris, E. Champion. 10 fr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

General.

Classen, E., On Vowel Alliteration in the Old Germanic Languages (University of Manchester Publications, Germanic Series, i). Manchester Univ. Press. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie. xxxiii. Jahrg. 1911. Berlin, Langenscheidt. 11 M.

Gothic.

Bibel, Die gotische. I. Matthäus, herausg. von E. Mayr. (Münchener Texte, v.) Munich, Callwey. 60 pf.

Mayr, E., Paradigmen zur gotischen Grammatik. (Münchener Texte, Ergänzungsreihe, i.) Munich, Callwey. 40 pf.

Scandinavian.

Bjornson, Bj., Artikler og Taler. 13.—15. Hefte. Christiania, Gyldendal. Each 30 øre.

HEUSLER, A., Altisländisches Elementarbuch. (Sammlung germanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, I. Reihe, III.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 5 M.

Mästerstycken ur Sveriges litteratur. IV. Bengt Lidner, Grefvinnan Spastaras död och Aaret 1783. V. Konung Gustaf III, Äreminne öfver riksrådet och fältmarskalken Lennart Torstenson. Stockholm, Lagerström. 5 kr. 50 and 4 kr. 50.

NERMAN, B., Studier i Svärges hedna litteratur. Upsala, Akad. bokh. 4 kr.

Norges Indskrifter, med de ældre Runer. Udgivne ved S. Bugge. Indledning. 2. Hefte. Christiania, J. Dybwad. 5 kr. 20.

PALUDAN, J., Fransk-engelsk Indflydelse paa Danmarks Litteraturhistorie i Holbergs Tidsalder. Aarhus, Nationale Forfatteres Forlag 9 kr.

STRINDBERG, A., Samlade skrikter. XII–XIV. Stockholm, A. Bonnier. 3 kr. 25; 2 kr. 25; 3 kr.

TEGNÉR, E., Samlade dikter. Nationalupplaga. Stockholm, Svenska bokförlag. 2 kr.

English.

(*a*) *Old English.*

BROTANEK, R., Texte und Untersuchungen zur altenglischen Literatur und Kirchengeschichte. Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M.

GREIN, C. W. M., Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter, neu herausg. von J. J. Köhler. 9. Lieferung. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 1 M. 50.

(*b*) *Modern English.*

American Poems, 1625–1892. Selected and edited with illustrative and explanatory notes and a bibliography. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 6*s*. net.

BREWSTER, W. T., The Writing of English. (Home University Library.) London, Williams and Norgate. 1*s*. net.

BRIDGES, R., Poetical Works. Oxford Edition. London, H. Milford. 1*s*. 6*d*. net.

BRILIOTH, B., A Grammar of the Dialect of Lorton (Cumberland). Upsala, Akad. Bokh. 4 kr.

BROOKE, S. A., Ten more Plays of Shakespeare. London, Constable. 7*s*. 6*d*. net.

BROWNING, R., Sordello, ed. by A. J. Whyte. London, Dent. 6*s*. net.

BRÜLL, H., Untergegangene und veraltete Worte des Französischen im heutigen Englisch. Halle, Niemeyer. 10 M.

BULLEN, A. H., Lyrics from the Dramatists of the Elizabethan Age. London, Sidgwick and Jackson. 1*s*. net.

BULLEN, A. H., Lyrics from the Song-books of the Elizabethan Age. London, Sidgwick and Jackson. 1*s*. net.

CHASE, L. N., Poe and his Poetry. (Poetry and Life Series.) London, Harrap. 1*s*. net.

CLARK, A. C., Prose rhythm in English: a lecture. London, H. Milford. 1*s*. 6*d*. net.

DAHLSTEDT, A., The Modern English Word-order in clauses with demonstrative and determinative verbal modifiers. Ystad, Benglsson.

DELATTRE, F., De Byron à Francis Thompson, essais de littérature anglaise. Paris, Payot. 3 fr. 50.

DRUMMOND, W., of Hawthornden. Poetical Works, with A Cypresse Grove, ed. by L. E. Kastner (University of Manchester Publications, English Series). 2 vols. Manchester Univ. Press. 21*s*. net.

Edmunds, E. W., Pope and his Poetry. (Poetry and Life Series.) London, Harrap. 1*s.* net.

Erler, E., Die Namengebung bei Shakespeare. (Anglistische Arbeiten, II.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 3 M. 80.

Ingelow, J., Poems. Oxford Edition. London, H. Milford. 2*s.*

Johnson, R. B., Tennyson and his Poetry. (Poetry and Life Series.) London, Harrap. 1*s.* net.

Jonson, B., The Poetaster; and Satiromastix by T. Dekker. Edited by J. H. Penniman. London, D. C. Heath. 3*s.* net.

Malone Society Reprints, 1912. The Resurrection of our Lord. H. Porter, The Two Angry Women of Abington, 1599. G. Peele, The Love of King David and Fair Bethsabe, 1599. The Weakest goeth to the Wall, 1600. Wily Beguiled, 1606. Englishmen for my Money, 1616.

Michaelis, H. and Jones, D., A Phonetic Dictionary of the English Language. Hanover, C. Meyer. 6 M.

Photiadès, C., G. Meredith: his Life, Genius and Teaching. London, Constable. 6*s.* net.

Ralph Roister Doister, with Introduction and Notes by C. G. Child. London, Harrap. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Ripari, R., Romantic and non-romantic Elements in the Works of Walter Scott. Florence, Ist. micrografico italiano. 2 L.

Selby-Bigge, L. A., British Moralists; being selections from writers principally of the 18th century. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 15*s.* net.

Sephton, J., A Handbook of Lancashire Place-names. Liverpool, Young and Sons. 6*s.* net.

Shakespeare, W., The Tragedie of Julius Caesar. New Variorum Edition, ed. by H. Furness, Jr. London, Lippincott. 15*s.* net.

Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, Jahrbuch der deutschen. xlix. Jahrg. Berlin, Langenscheidt. 11 M.

Shakespeare Reprints. II. Hamlet. Parallel Texts of the first and second Quartos and the first Folio. Ed. by W. Vietor. 2nd ed. Marburg, N. G. Elwert. 5 M.

Shelley, H. C., Shakespeare and Stratford. London, Simpkin, Marshall. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Smeaton, O., Longfellow and his Poetry. (Poetry and Life Series.) London, Harrap. 1*s.* net.

Swift, J., Correspondence. Vol. v. Edited by F. E. Ball. London, G. Bell. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Thompson, F., Works. 3 vols. London, Burns and Oates. Each 6*s.* net.

Trench, W. F., Shakespeare's Hamlet: a new Commentary. London, Smith, Elder. 6*s.* net.

Turner, L. M., Du conflit tragique chez les Grecs et dans Shakespeare. Paris, Ollier-Henry. 6 fr.

Vision of Piers the Plowman, The. Transl. by K. M. Warren. New ed. London, E. Arnold. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Walker, H. and Mrs H., Outlines of Victorian Literature. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3*s.* net.

German.

(a) General.

Förstemann, E., Altdeutsches Namenbuch. II. Band. I. Hälfte. 3. Auflage von H. Jellinghaus. Bonn, P. Hanstein. 60 M.

KLARÉN, G. A., Die Bedeutungsentwicklung von können, mögen und müssen im Hochdeutschen. Lund, Lindstedt. 2 kr.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

HARTMANN VON AUE, Der arme Heinrich. Herausg. von E. Gierach. (Germanische Bibliothek, III. Kritische Ausgaben, III.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M. 40.

JUETHE, E., Der Minnesänger Hiltbolt von Schwangau. (Germanistische Abhandlungen, XLIV.) Breslau, M. und H. Marcus. 3 M. 60.

Mittelhochdeutsche Minnereden. I. Die Heidelberger Handschriften 344, 358, 376 und 393, herausg. von K. Matthaei. (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, XXIV.) Berlin, Weidmann. 8 M.

PFANNMÜLLER, L., Frauenlobs Marienleich. (Quellen und Forschungen, CXX.) Strassburg, K. J. Trübner. 5 M.

POISSON, G., L'origine celtique de la légende de Lohengrin. Paris, E. Champion. 2 fr. 50.

Rittermaeren, Zwei altdeutsche. Moriz von Craon. Peter von Staufenberg. Neu herausg. von E. Schröder. 2. Aufl. Berlin, Weidmann. 3 M.

SEEHAUSEN, W., Michel Wyssenherres Gedicht 'Von dem edeln hern von Bruneczwigk' und die Sage von Heinrich dem Löwen. (Germanistische Abhandlungen, XLIII.) Breslau, M. und H. Marcus. 6 M. 40.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

BERGER, K., Theodor Körner. Bielefeld, Velhagen und Klasing. 3 M.

BOLZE, W., Schillers philosophische Begründung der Ästhetik der Tragödie. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 3 M.

BÜCHER, W., Grillparzers Verhältnis zur Politik seiner Zeit. (Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft, XIX.) Marburg, N. G. Elwert. 3 M. 50.

BÜTTNER, G., R. Prutz. Ein Beitrag zu seinem Leben und Schaffen von 1816–1842. (Teutonia, XXV.) Leipzig, E. Avenarius. 4 M.

CAMINADE, G., Les chants des Grecs et le philhellénisme de Wilhelm Müller. Paris, F. Alcan. 5 fr.

DAVID, F., F. H. Jacobis 'Woldemar' in seinen verschiedenen Fassungen. (Probefahrten, XXIII.) Leipzig, R. Voigtländer. 5 M. 80.

ECKERMANN, J. P., Gespräche mit Goethe, mit einer Einleitung von O. Pniower. Berlin, A. Weichert. 2 M.

EICHENDORFF, J. VON, Sämtliche Werke. III. Regensburg, J. Habbel. 4 M.

ENDERS, C., F. Schlegel. Die Quellen seines Wesens und Werdens. Leipzig, H. Haessel. 7 M. 50.

FRUCHT, E., Goethes Vermächtnis. Munich, Delphin-Verlag. 4 M.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Briefe. Ausgewählt und herausgegeben von E. von der Hellen. VI. Band. (Cotta'sche Bibliothek der Weltliteratur.) Stuttgart, Cotta. 1 M.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Italienische Reise. Wohlfeile Ausgabe besorgt von H. T. Kroeber. 2 vols. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 7 M. 50.

Goethe-Jahrbuch. XXXIV. Band. Frankfort, Rütten und Loening. 10 M.

HERMSEN, H., Die Wiedertäufer zu Münster in der deutschen Dichtung. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, XXXIII.) Stuttgart, J. B. Metzler. 4 M. 80.

HETTICH, L., Der fünffüssige Iambus in den Dramen Goethes. (Beiträge zur neuen Literaturgeschichte, IV.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 7 M.

HOLL, K., Gerhart Hauptmann: his Life and Work, 1862–1912. London, Gay and Hansen. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lockemann, T., Technische Studien zu Luthers Briefen an Friedrich den Weisen. (Probefahrten, xxii.) Leipzig, R. Voigtländer. 5 M. 80.

Lote, R., La France et l'esprit français jugés par le 'Mercure' de Wieland (1773–1793). Paris, F. Alcan. 4 fr.

Luther, M., Werke in Auswahl. Herausg. von O. Clemen. iii. Bd. Bonn, A. Marcus und E. Weber. 5 M.

Plotke, G., H. Heine als Dichter des Judentums, ein Versuch. Dresden, C. Reissner. 3 M.

Pustkuchen, J. F. W., Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre (1823–28). Mit einer Einleitung, Goethe und Pustkuchen, von L. Geiger. 5 Teile. Berlin, H. Barsdorf. 15 M.

Quellenschriften zur neueren deutschen Literatur. No. 4. Des Kard. von Retz Histoire de la conjuration du comte Jean Louis de Fresque. Nach der Ausgabe von 1682 herausg. von A. Leitzmann. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 1 M. 20.

Reitz, W., Die Landschaft in Th. Storms Novellen. (Sprache und Dichtung, xii.) Bern, A. Francke. 4 fr.

Rotten, E., Goethes Urphänomen und die platonische Idee. (Philosophische Arbeiten, viii, 1.) Giessen, A. Töpelmann. 4 M. 20.

Sachs, H., Sämtliche Fabeln und Schwänke, vi. Bd. (Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des xvi. und xvii. Jahrh. 231—235.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.

Sauer, E., Die französische Revolution von 1789 in zeitgenössischen deutschen Flugschriften und Dichtungen. (Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, xliv.) Weimar, A. Duncker. 3 M. 60.

Schlegel, Dorothea und Friedrich, Briefe an die Familie Paulus, herausg. von R. Unger. (Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrh. 146.) Berlin, B. Behr. 4 M.

Schlösser, R., August von Platen. ii. Bd. Munich, R. Piper. 14 M.

Schlösser, R., Die Quellen zu H. von Kleists Michael Kohlhaas. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, 116.) Bonn, A. Marcus and E. Weber. 35 pf.

Schwiefert, E., Rainer Maria Rilke. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. 2 M. 50.

Stoess, W., Die Bearbeitungen des 'Verbrechers aus verlorener Ehre.' (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, xxxvii.) Stuttgart, J. B. Metzler. 2 M. 40.

Thietz, R., Die Ballade vom Grafen und der Magd. Ein Rekonstruktionsversuch und Beitrag zur Charakterisierung der Volkspoesie. (Quellen und Forschungen, cxix.) Strassburg, K. J. Trübner. 4 M. 75.

Vulliod, A., Peter Rosegger. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Deutsch von M. Necker. Leipzig, L. Staackmann. 6 M.

Wenke, A., Theodor Körner. Ein Dichter- und Heldenleben. Dresden, Mignon-Verlag. 1 M. 25.

Wildenbruch, E. von, Gesammelte Werke. i. Reihe. 6. Band. Berlin, G. Grote. 4 M.

Witkop, P., Die neuere deutsche Lyrik. ii. Band. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 5 M.

Wundt, M., Goethes Wilhelm Meister und die Entwicklung des modernen Lebensideals. Berlin, G. J. Göschen. 8 M.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS